

**REGULAR WEEKLY SESSION-----ROANOKE CITY COUNCIL**

**July 16, 2001**

**2:00 p.m.**

**The Council of the City of Roanoke met in regular session on Monday, July 16, 2001, at 2:00, p.m., the regular meeting hour, in the City Council Chamber, fourth floor, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, Virginia, with Mayor Ralph K. Smith presiding, pursuant to Chapter 2, Administration, Article II, City Council, Section 2-15, Rules of Procedure, Rule 1, Regular Meetings, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended.**

**PRESENT: Council Members W. Alvin Hudson, Jr., William White, Sr., Linda F. Wyatt, William D. Bestpitch, William H. Carder, and Mayor Ralph K. Smith--6.**

**ABSENT: Council Member C. Nelson Harris-----  
----1.**

**OFFICERS PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; James D. Grisso, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.**

**The meeting was opened with a prayer by The Reverend James Beatty, Pastor, Bethel AME Church, Cave Spring.**

**The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was led by Mayor Ralph K. Smith.**

**PRESENTATIONS:**

**TRAFFIC-COUNCIL-CHURCHES-DECEASED PERSONS:**  
**The Mayor advised that on Sunday, July 1, 2001, 12 youth and two adults from Virginia Heights Baptist Church who were returning to Roanoke from a Christian youth camp in Myrtle Beach, South**

Carolina, were involved in an accident; three youth remain in the hospital with serious and critical injuries; and Miss Jessika Lewis, a 13 year old youth who was critically injured in the accident, passed away on Friday, July 6, 2001.

Vice-Mayor Carder offered the following resolution expressing sympathy to the congregation of Virginia Heights Baptist Church, and to the family of Miss Jessika Lewis:

(#35457-071601) A RESOLUTION expressing sympathy to the congregation of Virginia Heights Baptist Church and their pastor, our fellow Council member, The Reverend C. Nelson Harris.

(For full text of Resolution, see Resolution Book No. 64.)

**ACTION:**

Mr. Carder moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35457-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----  
---6.

NAYS: None-----  
---0.

(Council Member Harris was absent.)

PROCLAMATIONS: The Mayor presented a Proclamation declaring Sunday, August 5, 2001, as National Kids Day.

(For full text, see proclamation on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

**CONSENT AGENDA**

The Mayor advised that all matters listed under the Consent Agenda were considered to be routine by the Members of Council and would be enacted by one motion in the form, or forms, listed on the Consent Agenda, and if discussion was desired, that item would be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered separately. He called specific attention to one request for a Closed Meeting to discuss appointment of a new Municipal Auditor.

**COUNCIL-MUNICIPAL AUDITOR:** A communication from Council Member William White, Sr., Chair, Audit Committee, requesting that Council convene in a Closed Meeting to discuss appointment of a new Municipal Auditor, pursuant to Section 2.1-344 (A)(1), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, was before the body.

(For full text, see communication on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

**ACTION:**

Mr. White moved that Council concur in the request of Council Member White to convene in a Closed Meeting to discuss appointment of a new Municipal Auditor, pursuant to Section 2.1-344 (A)(1), Code of Virginia (1950), as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

**AYES:** Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----  
---6.

**NAYS:** None-----  
---0.

(Council Member Harris was absent.)

**ZONING:** A communication from Edward A. Natt, Attorney, representing Southside Development Company, with regard to rezoning a parcel of land containing 4.05 acres, more or less, designated as Official Tax No. 2280601, situate at the southeast terminus of Bean Street, N. W. (Tract III, Eden Park), from C-1,

Commercial District, to LM, Light Manufacturing District, was before Council.

He explained that the City Clerk discovered that the legal advertisement for the public hearing on July 16 was not published in The Roanoke Times; his client is under severe time guidelines and constraints; as a result of the newspaper's mistake, the matter would normally not be heard until the Council meeting on August 20 at 7:00 p.m.; however, his client requests that Council make an exception to its normal policy and authorize the matter to be advertised for public hearing at the regular meeting of Council to be held on Monday, August 6, 2001, at 2:00 p.m.

(For full text, see communication on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

**ACTION:**

Mr. White moved that Council concur in the request. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----  
---6.

NAYS: None-----  
---0.

(Council Member Harris was absent.)

**CITY PROPERTY-LEASES:** A communication from the City Manager advising that following the request of the Specific Reading and Learning Difficulties Association (commonly referred to as Montessori School) to cancel its lease of property located at 3379 Colonial Avenue with the City of Roanoke, which request was granted, to be effective September 1, 2001, the City was contacted by a parents group, The New Vista Montessori School, which is interested in leasing a portion of the property for a similar purpose and have proposed a term of one year at \$3000; and in order to

consider a new lease, Council must hold a public hearing, was before the body.

The City Manager recommended that the City Clerk be authorized to advertise a public hearing for Monday, August 6, 2001, to consider entering into a new lease for the building and approximately 7.2 acres of real estate associated with property located at 3379 Colonial Avenue, S. W.

(For full text, see communication on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

**ACTION:**

Mr. White moved that Council concur in the recommendation of the City Manager. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----  
---6.

NAYS: None-----  
---0.

(Council Member Harris was absent.)

The City Manager presented copy of a communication from Jeffrey D. Krantz, representing New Vista Montessori School, advising that the terms of the lease are as follows:

One year with the request to renew year to year for an additional four years,

Annual lease fee of \$3,000.00, and

General upkeep and maintenance of property and grounds will be the responsibility of New Vista Montessori School.

**OATHS OF OFFICE-ROANOKE ARTS COMMISSION-YOUTH-PENSIONS-COMMITTEES:** The following reports of qualification

were before Council:

Sharon Hicks as a member of the Youth Services  
Citizen Board for a term ending May 31, 2004;

George Kegley as a member of the Roanoke Arts  
Commission for a term ending June 30, 2002; and

William E. Skeen as a member of the Board of  
Trustees, City of Roanoke Pension Plan, for a term  
ending June 30, 2005.

(See Oaths or Affirmations of Office on file in the City Clerk's  
Office.)

**ACTION:**

Mr. White moved that the reports of qualification be received  
and filed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted  
by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch,  
Carder, and Mayor Smith-----  
---6.

NAYS: None-----  
---0.

(Council Member Harris was absent.)

**REGULAR AGENDA**

**HEARING OF CITIZENS UPON PUBLIC MATTERS:**

**HOUSING/AUTHORITY-TOTAL ACTION AGAINST  
POVERTY-HABITAT FOR HUMANITY:** William Poe, representing  
the Roanoke Regional Housing Network, presented copy of the 21<sup>st</sup>  
Century Challenge to Eliminate Substandard Housing in the  
Roanoke Valley report. He advised that the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Challenge  
was first introduced to Roanoke in the fall season of 1999, and  
since that time the committee, which is composed of

representatives of the Blue Ridge Housing Development Corporation, Total Action Against Poverty, Habitat for Humanity, City of Roanoke, Northwest Neighborhood Environmental Organization, Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority and the Council of Community Services, developed the housing report. He stated that the challenge is to eliminate substandard housing in the City of Roanoke within ten years and Members of City Council are requested to accept that challenge. Over the past 18 months, he noted that 26 organizations have surveyed seven inner City neighborhoods, in order to provide a bench mark from which to build in view of the numerous opportunities to improve housing in the City of Roanoke. He stated that there is no justification for substandard housing in Roanoke City today because of existing resources; however those resources need to be better allocated, with a commitment to housing. He requested that Council accept the challenge and make a commitment to eliminate substandard housing which cannot be done by government alone, but requires the assistance of neighborhood organizations, churches, and for profit and not for profit groups. He stated that the recommendations contained in the 21st Century Report are broken down into three areas: legislative, administrative and funding as set forth in Volume I, Pages 1 - 11. Administratively, he noted that additional support is requested to make the Rental Compliance Program mandatory, that the City continue to provide the Vacant House Catalogue and create a loan pool of \$10 million for inner city housing projects and renovation by utilizing a combination of municipal bonds, a Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority low interest bond issue and Community Development Block Grant funds as a loan loss reserve to entice lending institutions to re-establish a loan pool.

Elizabeth Middleton, Director of Community Development and Outreach, Total Action Against Poverty, advised that survey instruments were developed in the spring of 2000 by a partnership which included representatives of Roanoke City, the Northwest Neighborhood Environmental Organization, interns, and Total Action Against Poverty. She stated that surveys were conducted by individuals and representatives of community groups and more than 25 different community groups participated in the actual

survey taking. She referred to Volume I of the report which consists of information about each neighborhood, housing conditions, including color coded maps, and Volume II which provides a list of all vacant properties within the neighborhoods that were surveyed that offer opportunities for future development. She explained that the survey is accurate within plus or minus five per cent and is intended to serve as an overall snapshot of the conditions of housing within the City of Roanoke.

Theodore J. Edlich, Executive Director, Total Action Against Poverty, advised that over 50 per cent of housing in the downtown neighborhoods is in good condition; and one-fourth of all lots in inner city neighborhoods are vacant with approximately \$20,000.00 worth of infrastructure on each lot. He stated that only 142 structures were identified as boarded up buildings, which is a low number of houses where significant impact could be made, because each of those houses has a detrimental effect on the blocks and the neighborhoods in which they are located, and they depreciate the worth of housing and discourage additional housing. He noted that housing is also an economic development issue; there are approximately 1800 vacant lots and if a \$100,000.00 house is constructed on each of those lots, \$2 million of additional revenues would be generated to the City, and, based on the number of persons per household, there could be as many as 5000 additional persons which would help to increase the City's population to over the 100,000 mark at which point the City would become the beneficiary of other kinds of government resources. He noted that downtown housing will not happen in and of itself, but only if plans are developed and a commitment is made to make a difference, and it is believed that the neighborhoods, along with the entire community, are interested in targeting downtown neighborhoods in order to bring them up to a quality level. He referred to a communication from Dr. Anthony Stavola, Past President, Greater Raleigh Court Civic League, urging City leaders to use the 21st Century Report and recommendations, along with recommendations from the Roanoke Renaissance report, to



develop a strategy to revitalize inner city neighborhoods, to strengthen the rental inspection program effort, and to develop new programs to promote home ownership and incentives that will encourage new housing development while preserving older housing that is in sound condition.

There was discussion in regard to specific models used by other localities that could help the City of Roanoke to implement certain recommendations contained in the report; the proposed new research centre on South Jefferson Street which will attract persons to the area who will have a choice as to where they live in the Roanoke Valley which will involve sensitive issues that need to be addressed, along with construction of infill housing with the proper design specifications so that houses will be compatible with the character of the neighborhoods; some communities in the Commonwealth of Virginia have offered creative housing enticements to new teachers and law enforcement officers by identifying houses in need of renovation and making the housing available with low interest loans and/or grants to renovate the structures; with low interest loans and there is a need for commitment from the private sector to create market rate housing and to reclaim vacant lots.

Estelle H. McCadden, 2128 Mercer Avenue, N. W., representing the Presidents' Council of Neighborhood Organizations, encouraged citizens to insure that their neighborhoods are listed correctly in the housing report. She read a communication from the Presidents' Council advising that the report represents a comprehensive survey of housing conditions in inner city areas; neighborhood groups represented by the Presidents' Council have been at the forefront of the day to day battles to save Roanoke's neighborhoods; the vitality and growth of the City are linked to this effort and if these neighborhoods do not receive the attention and investment they need to build on efforts already underway, none of the City's efforts in economic development, parks improvements, or new facilities will be successful in the long term; and if the City is to provide the mix of housing options necessary to stabilize its population and to bring new residents to the community, these areas must be revitalized.

**(See communication on file in the City Clerk's Office.)**

**Bob Caudle, 4231 Belford Street, S. W., advised that residents of the Greater Deyerle area believe that the entire City is their neighborhood and wish to offer their assistance as needed.**

**Mark Petersen, President, Southeast Action Forum, endorsed the recommendations contained in the housing report. He stated that he chose to live in the southeast quadrant of the City because it is an affordable area; however, many homes are rented to persons who have no vested interest in the house in which they reside, the property owner will do only the minimal amount of work that is necessary to keep the house in repair in order to comply with the housing code; however, the housing code does not go far enough to encourage the sale of the house to an individual who would be interested in relocating to the City of Roanoke. Second, he added that there is a problem with weed abatement and abandoned vehicles, which are issues that can be easily corrected if the current complaint system is eliminated; i.e: a neighbor calls the City to report overgrown lawns that need to be mowed or vehicles that need to be removed. He encouraged the City to move away from the current complaint system to a more proactive system by hiring additional code enforcement officers to focus on these types of complaints which will eliminate the need for reporting complaints by citizens, because many citizens are reluctant to report code violations for fear of retaliation from their neighbors. He called attention to the plight of elderly citizens who cannot afford to make improvements to their homes and suggested that they be given a six year real estate tax assessment deferment, which would enable them to pay the deferment in six years at a low interest loan and invest the money that would be used for the tax assessment for housing repairs.**

**Mr. Ern Reynolds, 2059 Westover Avenue, S. W., presented information on implementing a public/private partnership for older structures.**

**(See document entitled, “Gentrifying Our Aging Houses and Old Buildings” on file in the City Clerk’s Office.)**

**V. Lee Wolfe, 206 Rutherford Court, N. W., President, Gainsboro Neighborhood Alliance, endorsed the challenge to eliminate substandard housing in Roanoke City. She advised that residents and the decency of their home environment give balance and integrity to the City and to the entire Roanoke Valley; and strict and immediate adherence to the recommendations in the final report submitted by the Roanoke Regional Housing Network will meet the objectives of the Gainsboro Neighborhood Alliance, Valley Beautiful and her personal mission which is to save Roanoke City from further distraction and decline.**

**(See communication on file in the City Clerk’s Office.)**

**No other persons wishing to address Council, and there being no further questions or comments by Council Members, without objection, the Mayor advised that the 21st Century Report and remarks of speakers would be received and filed.**

**VITAL SIGNS-THE NEW CENTURY COUNCIL: Robert B. Manetta advised that in 1992, The New Century Council movement reviewed regional solutions to problems that multiple jurisdictions face, and the Vital Signs report was one of the projects that evolved from recommendations by a variety of components of The New Century Council study process. He introduced Priscilla Richardson, Communications and Marketing Consultant, to present findings contained in the Vital Signs report.**

**Ms. Richardson advised that in the early 1990's, more than 1,000 citizen volunteers participated in a visioning process which identified goals and strategies for an area encompassing more than 500,000 people in western Virginia, including the Counties of Allegheny, Bland, Botetourt, Craig, Floyd, Franklin, Giles, Montgomery, Pulaski, Roanoke, Smyth and Wythe and the Cities of Clifton Forge, Covington, Radford, Roanoke and Salem, which was officially designated as Virginia’s Technology Corridor in 1997 by the Virginia General Assembly. She further advised that a number**

of regional projects grew from the original vision formulated by citizens of the region, one of the most prominent was the Vital Signs report. She stated that the project began in 1997 through numerous public meetings and discussions on indicators, or objective measures, which assess an area's environmental, social and economic health; and in 1998, the first data report, "Vital Signs: Community Indicators for the New Century Region", was published.

She advised that in 1999 a second report, "Toward Sustainability: Virginia's Technology Corridor in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century", was published, which provided a detailed discussion of sustainable development and analysis of new subjective data on perceptions of residents of their quality of life; and "Vital Signs: Sustainability Indicators for Virginia's Technology Corridor" is the third report published as a result of the project, which provides a background on the project, describes national and international sustainable development movements and connects Vital Signs with the initiative led by the Environmental Law Institute.

Ms. Richardson explained that according to analysis of the data in the Vital Signs report, Virginia's Technology Corridor has made only modest improvements in social, economic and environmental indicators over the past several years, despite the strong economy, and for this reason, the region needs to take bolder steps toward building a more sustainable society; and major findings of the report include:

The region comprises only 7.7 per cent of the population of Virginia (down from 8.2 per cent in 1990, which translates into less state legislative influence, but greater opportunity to build a sustainable society;

Pounds of solid waste per year per person increased to 1,758, still above the national average of 1600 pounds;

**Total parks and recreational acres per 1,000 residents (1,297) remains well above the total for Virginia (291), but the region needs to take bolder steps to prevent the gradual erosion of agricultural land by urban sprawl;**

**Births to teenage girls (ages 15 - 17) declined in 1996 and 1997, but increased in 1998 and were down slightly in 1999;**

**Child abuse figures declined from 1998 to 1999, but remains above the rate per 1,000 children compared to Virginia;**

**Elder abuse figures remain higher than figures for Virginia;**

**Person-to-person and property crime rates remain under those of Virginia, but juvenile arrest rates are higher and increased since 1996;**

**Education, SOL scores have improved, but percentage of fully accredited schools remains below the percentage for the entire state;**

**Health indicators show improvements in pre-natal care; infant mortality rates are better than rates for Virginia, but increased from 1996 to 1998; accidental death rates have been falling, as have suicide rates, but suicide rates remain higher than those of the state; and**

**Economic indicators show growth in per capita income (but figures are still below the state and nation), slow employment growth compared to the state, and**

**educational levels (high school and college graduates lower than those of the state or nation).**

**In closing, Ms. Richardson advised that the report concludes with three recommendations for business, government and non-profit organizations; i.e.:**

**Participate in “education for sustainability” a task in which the news media is crucial to show the links among the environment, the economy and the community;**

**Keep, refine and use indicators of sustainability; and**

**Move the community toward sustainability by daily, organizational and individual action.**

**(See Vital Signs report on file in the City Clerk’s Office.)**

**There being no questions or comments, without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that the Vital Signs report and remarks of Ms. Richardson would be received and filed.**

**PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS: None.**

**REPORTS OF OFFICERS:**

**CITY MANAGER:**

**BRIEFINGS: None.**

**ITEMS RECOMMENDED FOR ACTION:**

**WORKERS COMPENSATION-CITY EMPLOYEES: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that all employees of the City of Roanoke are covered by workers’ compensation as required by state law; the City of Roanoke is self-administered and self-insured for Workers’ Compensation; currently, the City**

experiences approximately 400 new Workers' Compensation claims annually, and continues to administer some active claims from previous years, which involve significant amounts of paperwork and can be handled more efficiently by a company that deals with workers' compensation exclusively; and the Office of Risk Management initiated an evaluation process to determine the logic of employing a Workers' Compensation Third Party Administrator.

It was further advised that after submission of requests for proposals, non-binding on the part of the City, four Third Party Administrators were interviewed, with Landin, Inc., being the clear choice of all panel members; Landin proposes to administer all workers' compensation claims for the City for a fee comparable to that of hiring a workers' compensation specialist to replace the person who recently retired; Landin has offered the assurance that all injured City employees will receive quality service to speed their recovery; use of a Third Party Administrator should enable the Office of Risk Management to spend more time administering general liability and automobile liability claims; and these classes of claims have the greatest potential financial impact to have their outcomes affected by extra time and effort devoted to their investigation and administration.

The City Manager recommended that she be authorized to enter into a one year contract, with an option to renew for two additional one year periods by mutual agreement, with Landin, Inc., to perform Third Party Administrator functions for Workers' Compensation for the City of Roanoke, in an amount not to exceed \$40,000.00 per annum.

(For full text, see communication on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

Mr. Carder offered the following resolution:

**"A RESOLUTION authorizing the acceptance of a bid and execution of a contract with Landin, Inc., for the provision of services as a third party administrator for workers' compensation claims for the City upon certain terms and conditions, and rejecting all other bids received."**

**Mr. Carder moved the adoption of the resolution. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson.**

**There was discussion in regard to controlling costs; will private company encourage employees to return to work as soon as possible; will employees find themselves in a position where they will be dealing with a company over which the City has no control; there should be a clear understanding of budget complications; and Council Members should be provided with a summary of major contract provisions.**

**In view of the number of unanswered questions by Council Members, Mr. White moved that action on the report be tabled. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted.**

**Later during the meeting, Mr. Hudson moved that the matter be removed from the table. The motion was seconded by Mr. White and adopted, Council Member Wyatt abstained from voting.**

**The City Manager presented copy of the proposed contract with Landin, Inc., which provides for a flat fee of \$40,000.00. She advised that there is no financial incentive other than to manage the City's entire Worker's Compensation caseload, with a goal to assist the employee into the proper medical setting so that he or she can return to work as soon as possible. She explained that the reduction of one full time staff position, with salary and benefits, exceeded the \$40,000.00 contract fee with Landin, Inc.; Workmen's Compensation law provides that any company serving on the City's behalf should not release an employee to return to work until the employee is released by his or her personal physician; and the expertise that the City is seeking through the contract with Landin, Inc., is to insure that the City has proper medical case management. She called attention to a provision in the contract that provides for the agreement to be renewed for two successive**



**12 month periods unless there is 90 days advance notice to the contrary by the City.**

**The City Manager explained that the City of Roanoke is one of the few communities that continues to administer Worker's Compensation claims and inasmuch as the entire field has become more complex, it is not unusual for municipalities to seek outside expert assistance.**

**Ms. Wyatt referred to that portion of the contract which provides that court costs and fees, attorney fees, fees for under cover operatives and detectives, costs for professional expert testimony, opinions or advice, claims for medical examination fees, costs for reports from government agencies, certain medical and vocational rehabilitation costs, costs for printing and photocopying are not covered in the \$40,000.00 contract fee. She advised that such expenses can be costly items and inquired as to the responsible party for making the determination on when those services are necessary.**

**The City Manager advised that excluded costs are currently incurred by the City on occasion, outside of an analysis of the comparison costs of the staff position versus contract costs. She explained that excluded costs would be authorized by the City in advance and the contract would be clarified accordingly.**

**Mr. Hudson inquired if the City has written documentation from other jurisdictions that have used outside contractors; whereupon, the City Manager advised that she would respond to the question at a later date.**

**Mr. White called attention to the need for a provision in the contract which would require the City's approval on costs in excess of a certain dollar amount. Additionally, he stated that there is no non-discrimination provision in the proposed contract,**

although he was of the understanding that Council intended for all contracts entered into by the City to contain a standard non-discrimination policy.

He also inquired as to the average of excluded costs incurred by the City over the past three years; whereupon, the City Manger advised that she would respond to the question at a later date.

The Director of Finance advised that in fiscal year 2000-01, the City spent \$1,050,000.00 on Worker's Compensation wages and medical claims, \$800,000.00 is budgeted in fiscal year 2001-02, and the types of costs under consideration are immaterial compared to that number.

In view of additional unanswered questions, Mr. Hudson moved that the matter be tabled until the next regular meeting of Council on Monday, August 6, 2001. The motion was seconded by Ms. Wyatt and adopted.

In response to a request by the City Manager for clarification of the types of information to be provided, Members of Council requested the following:

What safeguards are included in the contract to protect the City's interests in regard to excluded costs, and at what point would Landin, Inc., be required to obtain the City's approval for such expenses.

How will the new system benefit City employees?

A copy of the request for proposals which contains the scope of services.

There should be more communication between the City administration and Council Members on questions pertaining to agenda items prior to the Council meeting.

The proposed contract with Landin, Inc., and any other

**contract entered into by the City, should contain a standard non-discrimination clause.**

**Copy of documentation from other jurisdictions of comparable size to Roanoke in regard to advantages of using outside contractors; and additional costs incurred in addressing workers' compensation claims.**

**There was discussion with regard to including the non-discrimination clause in all City contracts, in which Mr. White and Ms. Wyatt requested that the record reflect that they intend to vote against any City contract that does not include the non-discrimination clause.**

**GENERAL SERVICES-BUDGET-CITY INFORMATION SYSTEMS:** The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the Management Services Fund provides organizational support services for photocopying, postage, printing and courier services; responsibility for Management Services currently lies with the Department of Management and Budget (DMB); however, DMB's approved strategic business plan reassigns the responsibilities of the Management Services Fund to other departments, as follows:

- Courier, mail processing and printing activities is reassigned to the Department of General Services; and**
- Photocopying is reassigned to the Department of Technology due to the impending convergence of photocopying and printer technology.**

**The City Manager recommended that Council adopt a budget ordinance reallocating revenues and appropriations from the Management Services Fund to the Departments of General**

**Services and Technology.**

**(For full text, see communication on file in the City Clerk's Office.)**

**Mr. Carder offered the following emergency budget ordinance:**

**(#35458-071601) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2001-2002 General, Water, Sewage, Civic Center, Department of Technology, Materials Control, Management Services, Fleet Management, and Risk Management Funds Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.**

**(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64.)**

**ACTION:**

**Mr. Carder moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35458-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. White and adopted by the following vote:**

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----  
---6.**

**NAYS: None-----  
---0.**

**(Council Member Harris was absent.)**

**BUDGET-PARKS AND RECREATION-CMERP: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that on October 2, 2001, Council concurred in funding recommendations for fiscal year 2000-01 Capital Maintenance and Equipment Replacement Program (CMERP); CMERP is used to fund equipment purchases, maintenance and other one-time priority purchases; the need has**

been identified to resurface, repair and restripe various tennis and basketball courts for Parks and Grounds Maintenance; and by Council approval is required for appropriation of funds from CMERP in order to acquire services.

It was further advised that bids were requested after due and proper advertisement; three (3) bids were received and evaluated; and McNeil Asphalt Maintenance, Inc., was the low responsive and responsible bidder and meets the required specifications.

The City Manager recommended that \$99,900.00 be appropriated from prior fiscal year's CMERP to an account in the Capital Projects Fund entitled, "Repair, Restripe and Resurface Tennis/Basketball Courts"; and that the City Manager be authorized to accept the bid of McNeil Asphalt Maintenance, Inc., at a total cost of \$99,900.00; and reject all other bids received by the City.

(For full text, see communication on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

Mr. Hudson offered the following emergency budget ordinance:

(#35459-071601) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2001-2002 General and Capital Projects Funds Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64.)

**ACTION:**

Mr. Hudson moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35459-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch.

Mr. White requested a list of projects included for funding from the Capital Maintenance and Equipment Replacement Program by location.

With regard to future reports, Mr. Bestpitch requested information identifying companies submitting bids, the amount of the bids, and the City Engineer's estimate of the project versus the actual low bid. He stated that it would be his preference to receive that level of detail on future projects.

Ordinance No. 35459-071601 was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----  
---6.

NAYS: None-----  
---0.

(Council Member Harris was absent.)

Mr. Carder offered the following emergency ordinance:

(#35460-071601) AN ORDINANCE accepting the bid of McNeil Asphalt Maintenance, Inc., to repair, resurface and restripe tennis and basketball courts for Parks and Grounds Maintenance, upon certain terms and conditions; and rejecting all other bids made for such items; and providing for an emergency.

(For full text of Ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64.)

**ACTION:**

Mr. Carder moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35460-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----  
---6.

NAYS: None-----  
---0.

**(Council Member Harris was absent.)**

**POLICE DEPARTMENT-BUDGET-FIRE DEPARTMENT-EQUIPMENT:** The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the City currently has 58 Keyboard Data Terminals (KDTs) that are in use in vehicles of the Police (54) and Fire Departments (4); KDTs are no longer in production by Motorola and replacement parts are no longer manufactured; advances in technology offer the City the opportunity to employ mobile computers that increase Police Officer safety and efficiency; evaluation of current technology and objectives set forth by the Public Safety Team caused the Panasonic CF28 to be the preferred mobile computer by the City of Roanoke; Roanoke City, Roanoke County, and the Town of Vinton participated in a Request For Quotation for mobile computers and required accessories; and vendors offering the Panasonic CF28, as well as vendors offering comparatively designed mobile computers, were invited to submit competitive bids.

It was further advised that eight bids were received and evaluated; the evaluation revealed that GTSI Corporation's bid of \$5,406.00 per mobile computer, mount, operating system software and extended warranty was the low bid; the Vehicle Radio Modem and Text Messenger required to operate the mobile computers were bid only by Motorola, Inc., at a price of \$3,097.00 per unit, at a total cost per unit of \$8,503.00; funding totaling \$340,120.00 is included in Account No. 013-052-9831-9203 for the purchase of 40 mobile computers and required components; and the remaining 18 units, totaling \$153,054.00, will be funded from the Department of Technology's prior years retained earnings fund.

The City Manager recommended that Council authorize acceptance of the bids of GTSI Corporation for the purchase of mobile computers, pursuant to details of the bid dated May 16, 2001; Motorola, Inc., for purchase of Vehicle Radio Modems and Text Messenger, pursuant to details of the bid dated May 16, 2001; reject all other bids received by the City; authorize the City Manager to execute all forms and agreements with GTSI Corporation and Motorola, Inc.; and

appropriate \$153,054.00 from Department of Technology Retained Earnings to Account No. 013-430-1602-9015.

(For full text, see communication on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

Mr. Carder offered the following emergency budget ordinance:

(#35461-071601) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2001-2002 Department of Technology Fund Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.

(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64.)

**ACTION:**

Mr. Carder moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35461-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson.

Ms. Wyatt expressed concern that the City has not engaged in long range planning to meet ever changing technology needs. She encouraged leasing as opposed to purchasing computers inasmuch as the technology changes at such a rapid pace.

Mr. White suggested that the matter of including line items in future fiscal year budgets for technology, vehicle replacement and other items be referred to the City Manager and to fiscal year 2002-03 budget study; whereupon, without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that the matter would be referred to the City Manager and to fiscal year 2002-03 budget study.

Ordinance No. 35461-071601 was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----  
--0.

(Council Member Harris was absent.)

Mr. Carder offered the following resolution:



**(#35462-071601) A RESOLUTION accepting the bid of GTSI Corporation for the purchase of mobile computers and accepting the bid of Motorola, Inc., for the purchase of vehicle radio modems and Text Messenger Software, upon certain terms and conditions, and awarding contracts therefor; authorizing the proper City officials to execute the requisite contracts for such items; and rejecting all other bids made to the City for the items.**

**(For full text of resolution, see Resolution Book No. 64.)**

**ACTION:**

**Mr. Carder moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35462-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:**

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----  
--0.**

**(Council Member Harris was absent.)**

**TRAFFIC-EQUIPMENT-STREETS AND ALLEYS: The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the Capital Maintenance and Equipment Replacement Program for the prior year identified the need to replace two 2½ ton dump trucks, two 10 ton dump trucks and one 15 ton dump truck in the Streets and Traffic Department; bids were requested and eight bids were received; the lowest responsive and responsible bid submitted on all chassis was Magic City Motor Corporation, at a unit cost of \$36,540.00 for the 2½ ton chassis, \$45,333.00 for the 10 ton chassis and \$53,892.00 for the 15 ton chassis, for a total cost of \$217,638.00; the lowest responsive and responsible bid submitted on all dump bodies was Roanoke Welding Company, at a unit cost of \$3,895.00 for the 2½ ton dump body, \$4,465.00 for the 10 ton dump body and \$7,200.00 for the 15 ton dump body, for a total cost of \$23,920.00; and funding is available from the SunTrust Lease of Vehicle, Account No. 017-440-9851-9015.**

**The City Manager recommended that Council authorize award of**

bids as above set forth, and issuance of purchase orders, in the total amount of \$241,558.00, and reject all other bids received by the City.

(For full text, see communication on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

Mr. Bestpitch offered the following resolution:

(#35463-071601) A RESOLUTION accepting certain bids for the purchase of trucks and related equipment, upon certain terms and conditions, and rejecting all other bids made for such equipment.

(For full text of resolution, see Resolution Book No. 64.)

**ACTION:**

Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35463-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----6.

NAYS: None-----  
--0.

(Council Member Harris was absent.)

**POLICE DEPARTMENT-ACTS OF ACKNOWLEDGEMENT-EQUIPMENT:** The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the Roanoke City Police Department's new building at 348 West Campbell Avenue is nearing completion; funding for the building did not include exercise equipment for a fitness room on the second floor; the Roanoke Association Chapter of the Virginia Police Benevolent Association (PBA) has offered to donate \$20,000.00 toward purchase of exercise equipment, which is new equipment, including a treadmill for cardiovascular exercise, as well as free weights, benches, and protective pads for the floor; no restrictions will be imposed on the use of donated equipment by any Police Department employee, however, it is requested that a plaque be installed in the room to acknowledge the

donation; and Section 2-263, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, requires action by Council to approve acceptance of gifts exceeding \$5,000.00 in value.

The City Manager recommended that Council authorize acceptance of exercise equipment, valued at \$20,000.00, from the Roanoke Association Chapter of the Virginia Police Benevolent Association, Inc., and express appreciation for said donation.

(For full text, see communication on file in the City Clerk’s Office.)

Mr. Hudson offered the following resolution:

(#35464-071601) A RESOLUTION authorizing the City Manager to accept the donation of exercise equipment, valued at \$20,000.00, for the Police Department’s new building from the Roanoke Association Chapter of the Virginia Police Benevolent Association, and expressing appreciation for the donation.

(For full text of resolution, see Resolution Book No. 64.)

**ACTION:** Mr. Hudson moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35464-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote:

**AYES:** Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----6.

**NAYS:** None-----  
--0.

(Council Member Harris was absent.)

**BUDGET-GRANTS-TREES:** The City Manager submitted a communication advising that City staff identified a \$10,000.00 Urban and Community Forestry Grant available to communities through the Virginia Department of Forestry; application for the grant was made through a proposal entitled, “Demonstration Project: Central City Tree Planting”; the project is needed because tree replacement in Roanoke’s central city neighborhoods has not kept pace with other urban

neighborhoods; and the Virginia Department of Forestry notified the City of Roanoke on June 5, 2001, that a grant of \$10,000.00 was awarded to the City of Roanoke for the project.

It was further advised that the Urban and Community Forestry Grant is a Federal grant sponsored by the U. S. Forest Service and administered by the Virginia Department of Forestry; funds are awarded on a reimbursement basis after verification of match; the grant requires a 50 per cent local match; sufficient matching funds were identified using \$3,674.00 funds from Supplies-Trees Account No. 001-053-4340-3004, a Parks and Grounds operating budget account, and \$6,326.00 in kind match using department labor and equipment costs; the \$10,000.00 grant award will be used to purchase an estimated 50 trees at an estimated cost of \$200.00 each, which will be purchased, planted and guaranteed by a professional landscaping company; as part of the project, the City will also purchase 50 wholesale trees for planting by City employees in the central City neighborhoods in cooperation with various neighborhood organizations; a request for reimbursement of \$10,000.00 will be submitted following completion of the project in the Spring of 2002; and time of performance of the project is July 1, 2001 through May 15, 2002.

The City Manager recommended that Council accept the Urban and Community Forestry Grant and authorize the City Manager to execute any required grant agreement, or other related documents, such agreement to be approved as to form by the City Attorney, and appropriate \$13,674.00 in Federal and local cash match funding in accounts to be established in the Grant Fund by the Director of Finance, the in-kind match of \$6,326.00 will be accounted for in the Parks and Grounds operating budget; and authorize establishment of corresponding revenue estimates in the Grant Fund.

(For full text, see communication on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

Mr. Bestpitch offered the following emergency budget ordinance:

(#35465-071601) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2001-2002 General and Grant Funds Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.

(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64.)

**ACTION:** Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35465-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson.

Mr. Bestpitch advised that trees are quality of life and health issues, additional initiatives will be developed in the coming weeks to address the matter, and requested that Council be receptive to measures that can be taken to prevent the loss of more trees in the City of Roanoke.

Ordinance No. 35465-071601 was adopted by the following vote:

**AYES:** Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----6.

**NAYS:** None-----  
--0.

(Council Member Harris was absent.)

Mr. Bestpitch offered the following resolution:

(#35466-071601) A RESOLUTION accepting the Urban and Community Forestry Grant from the Virginia Department of Forestry.

(For full text of resolution, see Resolution Book No. 64.)

**ACTION:** Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35466-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:

**AYES:** Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----6.

**NAYS:** None-----  
--0.

(Council Member Harris was absent.)

**BUDGET-HUMAN DEVELOPMENT-COMMITTEES:** The City Manager submitted a communication advising that the Human Services Committee budget, in the amount of \$474,769.00, was established by

**Council with adoption of the General Fund budget for fiscal year 2001-02 on May 7, 2001; requests from 40 agencies, totaling \$866,863.91 were received, and appeals were filed and heard on April 17, 2001, from the following agencies: All Star Clinics, TAP – HOPE VI Project, American Red Cross – Roanoke Chapter Disaster Services, Roanoke Adolescent Health Partnership, Northwest Neighborhood Environmental Organization, and Presbyterian Community Center; all appeals were denied and performance audits will be conducted by the Council of Community Services to evaluate effectiveness and efficiency of funded programs.**

**The City Manager recommended that Council transfer \$474,769.00 from the Human Services Committee, Account No. 001-630-5220-3700, to new line items to be established in the Human Services Committee budget by the Director of Finance, as set forth on Attachment 1 to the report; and that the City Manager be further authorized to execute contracts with The Salvation Army for the Homeless Housing Program - Red Shield Lodge, (\$14,000.00) and Abused Women's Shelter - The Turning Point, (\$14,000.00); St. John's Community Youth Program, Inc., (\$5,000.00); and the Council of Community Services, for performance audits (\$11,000.00).**

**(For full text, see communication on file in the City Clerk's Office.)**

**Mr. Hudson offered the following emergency budget ordinance:**

**(#35467-071601) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2001-2002 General Fund Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.**

**(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64.)**

**ACTION:**

**Mr. Hudson moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35467-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder.**

**Mr. White requested clarification with regard to Attachment 2 to the report which illustrates allocations/recommendations by Roanoke Valley jurisdictions, and inquired if the agencies had, in fact, requested funds from other area jurisdictions, to which question the City Manager advised that she would respond at a later date. Mr. White requested that Attachment 2 be deleted from the official record until it is known if other jurisdictions were specifically requested to provide their share of**

funding; whereupon, it was the consensus of Council that Attachment 2 would be withdrawn from the report, with the understanding that the City Manager will provide the requested information prior to the next meeting of Council on Monday, August 6, 2001.

Ordinance No. 35467-071601 was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Carder,  
and Mayor Smith-----  
-5.

NAYS: None-----  
--0.

(Council Member Harris was absent.) (Council Member Bestpitch advised that his spouse is employed by the YMCA of Roanoke Valley and since a percentage of funding is allocated to the organization, he will abstain from voting.)

Mr. Carder offered the following resolution:

(#35468-071601) A RESOLUTION concurring in the recommendations of the Human Services Committee ("Committee") for allocation of City funds to various nonprofit agencies and performance audits for Fiscal Year 2001- 2002; authorizing the City Manager, or her designee, to execute a contract with The Salvation Army for provision of services under the Homeless Housing Program and/or Abused Women's Shelter, to execute a contract with St. John's Community Youth Program, Inc., for provision of services, and to execute a contract with the Council of Community Services to perform the necessary audits.

(For full text of resolution, see Resolution Book No. 64.)

ACTION:

Mr. Carder moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35468-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Carder,  
and Mayor Smith-----  
-5.**

**NAYS: None-----  
--0.**

**(Council Member Harris was absent.) (Council Member Bestpitch  
advised that his spouse is employed by the YMCA of Roanoke Valley  
and since a percentage of funding is allocated to the organization, he  
will abstain from voting.)**

**DIRECTOR OF FINANCE:**

**BUDGET: The Director of Finance submitted a written report  
advising that at the close of fiscal year 2001, budgeted funds were  
obligated for outstanding encumbrances; purchase orders or contracts  
were issued for goods and services as of the close of fiscal year 2001,  
but delivery of the goods or performance of the services had not been  
completed; reappropriation of funds carries forward the unspent budget  
funds that were originally appropriated and are contractually obligated  
for the goods and services; and appropriation amounts are as follows:**

<b>General Fund Open Encumbrances</b>	<b>\$ 2,252,172.00</b>
<b>Water Fund Open Encumbrances</b>	<b>348,230.00</b>
<b>Sewage Fund Open Encumbrances</b>	<b>492,805.00</b>
<b>Civic Center Fund</b>	
<b>Open Encumbrances</b>	<b>59,952.00</b>
<b>Transportation Fund</b>	
<b>Open Encumbrances</b>	<b>960.00</b>
<b>Department of Technology Fund</b>	
<b>Open Encumbrances</b>	<b>144,811.00</b>
<b>Fleet Management Fund</b>	
<b>Open Encumbrances</b>	<b>118,989.00</b>
<b>School Fund Open Encumbrances</b>	<b>1,170,053.00</b>



**School Food Services Fund  
Open Encumbrances**

**24,695.00**

**The Director of Finance recommended that Council adopt budget ordinances reappropriating funds into the current year budget, in order that encumbrances may be properly liquidated.**

**(For full text, see report on file in the City Clerk's Office.)**

**Mr. White offered the following emergency budget ordinance:**

**(#35469-071601) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2001-2002 General Fund Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.**

**(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64.)**

**ACTION: Mr. White moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35469-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch and adopted by the following vote:**

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----  
--0.**

**(Council Member Harris was absent.)**

**Mr. Bestpitch offered the following emergency budget ordinance:**

**(#35470-071601) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2001-2002 Water Fund Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.**

**(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64.)**

**ACTION: Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35470-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:**

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----  
--0.**

**(Council Member Harris was absent.)**

**Mr. Bestpitch offered the following emergency budget ordinance:**

**(#35471-071601) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2001-2002 Sewage Fund Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.**

**(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64.)**

**ACTION: Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35471-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:**

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----  
--0.**

**(Council Member Harris was absent.)**

**Mr. Bestpitch offered the following emergency budget ordinance:**

**(#35472-071601) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2001-2002 Civic Center Fund Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.**

**(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64.)**

**ACTION:** Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35472-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:

**AYES:** Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----6.

**NAYS:** None-----  
--0.

(Council Member Harris was absent.)

Mr. Bestpitch offered the following emergency budget ordinance:

(#35473-071601) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2001-2002 Transportation Fund Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.

(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64.)

**ACTION:** Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35473-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:

**AYES:** Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----6.

**NAYS:** None-----  
--0.

(Council Member Harris was absent.)

Mr. Bestpitch offered the following emergency budget ordinance:

**(#35474-071601) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2001-2002 Department of Technology Fund Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.**

**(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64.)**

**ACTION: Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35474-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:**

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----  
--0.**

**(Council Member Harris was absent.)**

**Mr. Bestpitch offered the following emergency budget ordinance:**

**(#35475-071601) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2001-2002 Fleet Management Fund Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.**

**(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64.)**

**ACTION: Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35475-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:**

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----  
--0.**

**(Council Member Harris was absent.)**

**Mr. Bestpitch offered the following emergency budget ordinance:**

**(#35476-071601) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2001-2002 School Fund Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.**

**(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64.)**

**ACTION:               Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35476-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:**

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----  
-5.**

**NAYS: None-----  
--0.**

**(Council Member Harris was.) (Council Member Wyatt abstained from voting inasmuch as she is employed by the Roanoke City Public School System.)**

**Mr. Bestpitch offered the following emergency budget ordinance:**

**(#35477-071601) AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain certain sections of the 2001-2002 School Food Services Fund Appropriations, and providing for an emergency.**

**(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64.)**

**ACTION:               Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35477-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:**

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----  
-5.**

**NAYS: None-----  
--0.**

(Council Member Harris was absent.) (Council Member Wyatt abstained from voting inasmuch as she is employed by the Roanoke City Public School System.)

**CITY ATTORNEY:**

**CITY CODE-SEWERS AND STORM DRAINS:** The City Attorney submitted a written report advising that on June 18, 2001, Council adopted Ordinance No. 35423-061801, implementing recommendations contained in a letter from the City Manager to Council with regard to United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations requiring certain scientific study and evaluation every five years of the local limits section of the City's sewer use standards; following the required study, it was found that amendments to several definitions and sections of Article III, Sewer Use Standards, Chapter 26, Sewers and Sewage Disposal, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, is required; the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) also approved the amendments; upon review of the above referenced ordinance, it appears that one definition in §26-43, Definitions, relating to chemical oxygen demand (COD) and biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) ratios should have been deleted; in addition, subsection (k)(1)(b)(4) of §26-56, Discharge permits for industrial waste, requires the addition of two words; and amendments are of a housekeeping nature to correct an inadvertent oversight in the previous ordinance.

(For full text, see report on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

**Mr. White offered the following emergency ordinance:**

(#35478-071601) AN ORDINANCE amending and reordaining Chapter 26, Sewers and Sewage Disposal, Article III, Sewer Use Standards, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, by amending certain subsections of §26-43, Definitions, and §26-56, Discharge permits for industrial waste, with regard to certain items specifically regulated by this Code in order to comply with regulations of the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which proposed amendments have been approved by both the EPA and the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ); and providing for an emergency.

(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64.)

**ACTION:**                Mr. White moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35478-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

**AYES:** Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----6.

**NAYS:** None-----  
--0.

(Council Member Harris was absent.)

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES:**

**PARKS AND RECREATION:** A report of the City Planning Commission advising that the Acting Director of Parks and Recreation has requested that Washington Park be renamed to Booker T. Washington Park to reflect the history of the park; and the name change is also recommended by a citizen committee established to make improvements to Washington Park.

                  The City Planning Commission recommended that Council rename Washington Park as Booker T. Washington Park, as requested by the citizen committee and the Department of Parks and Recreation.

(For full text, see report on file in the City Clerk’s Office.)

                  Mr. Bestpitch offered the following resolution:

                  (#35479-071601) A RESOLUTION renaming Washington Park as the Booker T. Washington Park.

(For full text of resolution, see Resolution Book No. 64.)

**ACTION:**                Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35479-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----**  
**--0.**

**(Council Member Harris was absent.)**

**STREET NAMES-STREETS AND ALLEYS:** A report of the City Planning Commission advising that new industrial development along Frontage Road resulted in the extension of Ordway Drive from Hershberger Road to Ferndale Drive; a cul-de-sac was installed on Ferndale Drive near William Ruffner Middle School for traffic safety purposes; and the name of the new street connection was not changed to reflect the new street pattern.

The City Planning Commission recommended that Council rename Ferndale Drive from extended Ordway Drive to its terminus as Ordway Drive, and noted that there would be no change in the name of Ferndale Drive from Ferncliff Avenue to the cul-de- sac.

**(For full text, see report on file in the City Clerk's Office.)**

**Mr. Carder offered the following resolution:**

**(#35480-071601) A RESOLUTION** authorizing the City Manager to officially name a public right-of-way located within the City.

**(For full text of resolution, see Resolution Book No. 64.)**

**ACTION:** Mr. Carder moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35480-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

**AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----6.**

**NAYS: None-----**  
**--0.**

**(Council Member Harris was absent.)**

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None.**



**INTRODUCTION AND CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS:**

**Y.M.C.A.-CITY PROPERTY:** Ordinance No. 35438, authorizing the City Manager to execute an agreement, deed and any related and necessary documents providing for the sale and conveyance of City-owned property located at 506 Church Avenue and the adjoining lot, bearing Official Tax Nos. 1113419 and 1113418, to the YMCA of Roanoke Valley, Inc., upon certain terms and conditions, having previously been before the Council for its first reading on Monday, July 2, 2001, read and adopted on its first reading and laid over, was again before the body, Mr. Hudson offering the following for its second reading and final adoption:

(#35438-071601) AN ORDINANCE authorizing the City Manager to execute an agreement, deed and any related and necessary documents providing for the sale and conveyance of City-owned property located at 506 Church Avenue and the adjoining lot, bearing Official Tax Nos. 1113419 and 1113418, to the YMCA of Roanoke Valley, Inc., upon certain terms and conditions.

(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64.)

**ACTION:** Mr. Hudson moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35438-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carder and adopted by the following vote:

**AYES:** Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Carder, and Mayor Smith-----  
-5.

**NAYS:** None-----  
--0.

(Council Member Harris was absent.) (Council Member Bestpitch abstained from voting inasmuch as his spouse is employed by the YMCA of Roanoke Valley, Inc.)

**MOTIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

**INQUIRIES AND/OR COMMENTS BY THE MAYOR AND MEMBERS OF COUNCIL:**

**CELEBRATIONS-COUNCIL-STADIUM:** Mr. Hudson commended The Roanoke Times on sponsoring the “Music for Americans” celebration which was held at Victory Stadium on July 4th. He stated that he was proud of the fact that the City of Roanoke has a stadium that will accommodate thousands of persons.

**PARKS AND RECREATION:** Vice-Mayor Carder referred to the recent closure of the skateboard park which is located in Wasena Park for renovations. For the benefit of those persons who were unaware of the proposed renovations, he advised that construction will begin during the week of July 23rd and should be completed on or about August 30th.

**SPECIAL PERMITS-COMPLAINTS:** Vice-Mayor Carder referred to telephone calls and other forms of correspondence regarding the removal of basketball goals which encroach on City property adjacent to residential homes, some of which have been in existence for 15 - 20 years. He also referred to those instances where there are cul de sacs and one way streets where young people play basketball, and inquired if the basketball goals could be treated like an easement. He requested that the City Attorney research the question of whether the City could be indemnified against liability, upon application by the property owner.

**REFUSE COLLECTION-RECYCLING:** Vice-Mayor Carder referred to revisions to the City’s solid waste collection program, which went into effect on July 1, 2001, and requires citizens, in some instances, to place their refuse containers at the curb rather than at the alley for collection. He expressed concern that neighborhoods could become littered with refuse and/or unsightly because residents may choose to store their refuse containers at the front of their property.

He stated that as the City proceeds with the modified refuse collection process and, if it is discovered that neighborhoods are becoming unsightly and citizens are short cutting the process by leaving their refuse containers in front of their residence, it will be important to monitor the situation to insure that the City does not lose the integrity of its neighborhoods.

Mr. Bestpitch advised that based upon recent information received by Council, approximately 50 locations have been reinstated for alley collection that had previously been designated for street collection. He stated that if there are specific locations where street collection cannot be continued for a specific reason, then alley collection should be reinstated; however, in those locations where alley collection is possible, refuse should continue to be collected from the alley. He asked that the City administration continue to move forward and evaluate the situation in an effort to accommodate as many citizens as possible.

Mr. White requested an update by the City Manager on the status of refuse collection; whereupon, the City Manager expressed appreciation for Council's patience and tolerance through what has been a significant time of change for the community. She advised that the process has been a learning experience for staff in regard to the methods of communication that were used with citizens and how communication occurred as citizens called the City for assistance. She stated that every call was addressed, and as a result, 47 blocks of streets have been adjusted, which demonstrates that the City is trying to be flexible and sensitive to the concerns of its citizens. She stressed the importance of the cleanliness of the City which was demonstrated last fall when weekly collection of bulk trash and tree limbs was initiated. With regard to the modified refuse collection procedure, she advised that some mistakes were made and there were certain unforeseen circumstances that complicated the first two weeks; i.e.: the program should not have been initiated on a week that had a holiday which caused confusion, the City relied on the news media, the Presidents' Council of Neighborhoods and civic leagues as the primary methods of communication; however, issues of communication relating to future changes will be approached differently; and information will be mailed to each City resident by the end of the week providing an overview of the entire system. She stated that the Solid Waste Department was down by four positions when the program was started two weeks ago and two pieces of vehicular equipment were out of service, all of which were unforeseen circumstances. On the positive side, she stated that there has been a tremendous response to the recycling effort and the City is receiving calls from citizens requesting recycling containers who have not previously recycled. For the month

of May, she advised that the City collected 12 tons of plastic, aluminum, cans and glass and during the first week of the current program, which was a holiday week, nine tons were collected. She stated that there was confusion by citizens as to which recyclables to set out, there were a number of requests for physically challenged assistance, and some citizens were confused as to where refuse containers were to be placed, which led to a number of calls regarding miscollections and caused multiple collections in some parts of the City. She explained that the refuse collection cycle was relatively complete by Friday afternoon, July 20, and staff of Solid Waste Management was desirous of accomplishing the task on their own because there is a great sense of pride and morale in the Solid Waste division, with staff that is concerned about the cleanliness of the City as well; and the goal was to start the week of July 23 with a clean slate, with all citizens knowing the proper location to set out their refuse. She advised that Roanoke County staff worked alongside City staff on Saturday, July 21, with Roanoke County staff concentrating primarily on main streets and City crews working side streets and subdivisions; and approximately 38 tons of refuse were collected compared to a typical collection day of approximately 20 tons. She stated that collection started on Monday morning, July 16, on target with citizens having a better understanding as to the location where items were to be placed. She added that City staff has tried to insure that citizens are educated as to where their items are to be collected, a special telephone number was staffed on Saturday, July 14 to respond to questions and while some changes, are necessary, the system is beginning to work, call volumes are down compared to last week, and it is hoped that the community and Council will give City staff at least two additional weeks to make adjustments, to disseminate information and to clarify concerns. She stated that more and better services can be provided as a result of the change and taxpayers' money will be saved. She called attention to certain unsafe alleys in the City of Roanoke and noted that if refuse collection is returned to the alleys, significant changes will have to be made.

Ms. Wyatt advised that she appreciates the City Manager's willingness to revisit the issue if it is determined at a future date that street collection is not working. She asked that the City not find itself so locked into the new procedure that it is not willing to revisit the issue, because Council Members and City staff are elected and/or appointed to serve the community in the most cost effective manner, but at the same time, there is a responsibility to listen to the wishes of the citizens.

**Mr. Hudson concurred in the remarks of Council Members Bestpitch and Wyatt. He stated that based on citizen input he has received, street refuse collection is not working. He expressed concern for those senior citizens who wish to comply with the new program, but, for physical reasons, are unable to move their refuse containers to the street for collection.**

**The Mayor extended appreciation to Roanoke County for its willingness to assist the City on Saturday, July 21, in order to complete the weekly refuse collection cycle. He stated that on Thursday, July 19, which is his birthday, he will work on the back of a refuse collection vehicle which will give him a better understanding of the refuse collection process. He advised that several months ago, the City was approached with regard to debris build up along the banks of the Roanoke River, and on the morning of July 4th, 35 members of the Kiwanis Club collected three truck loads of debris from the banks of the Roanoke River. He stated that Kiwanians are willing to perform this volunteer task two times per year as a service to the City, and encouraged another civic organization to volunteer its services on Labor Day, September 3, 2001.**

**EMERGENCY SERVICES-FLOOD REDUCTION/CONTROL: The Mayor advised that he recently traveled with the Roanoke Chapter of the American Red Cross to the flood ravaged areas of West Virginia. While he commended the American Red Cross on the outstanding work of its volunteers, he stated that he observed a breakdown of local emergency service management in the West Virginia area. He requested that the City Manager provide Council with an update on the City of Roanoke's Emergency Disaster Plan.**

#### **OTHER HEARING OF CITIZENS UPON PUBLIC MATTERS:**

**The Mayor advised that this is a time for citizens to be heard; and matters requiring referral to the City Manager will be referred immediately for response, report or recommendation to Council.**

**COMPLAINTS-REFUSE COLLECTION-RECYCLING: Ms. Josephine Hutcheson, 1111 Loudon Avenue, N. W., advised that elimination of trash collection in alleys is unfair to residents of northwest Roanoke, as well as City sanitation workers. She stated that all citizens pay taxes, however, the City insists on doing what it wants,**

regardless of the wishes of the citizens. She added that closing alleys is not justified to save money, and it is unfair to senior citizens who, in some instances, must maneuver their refuse containers down steep inclines to reach the street, all for the cause of saving money. She asked that alley refuse collection services be reinstated.

Ms. Evelyn D. Bethel, 35 Patton Avenue, N. E., appeared before Council on behalf of all residents of Historic Gainsboro, Gilmer and Patton Avenues, N. E., and requested that residential trash collection return to procedures that were in effect prior to July 1, 2001; whereupon, she petitioned that the above referenced neighborhood be declared exempt from all curb side refuse collection. She stated that both alley and curbside collection is needed in Historical Gainsboro--alley collection for those residents on the south side of Gilmer and Patton Avenues because topography of the land requires pushing or pulling the large blue containers down a steep hill, embankment or steps. She explained that some south side residents do not need medical exemption, but they are elderly citizens who cannot manipulate the large blue containers down and up the embankment. In addition to individual concerns, she added that residents are concerned about the health and safety of City employees who will have to negotiate hills or steps in all kinds of weather which can be hazardous. She called attention to the need for clarification as to which day refuse collection will take place in each quadrant of the City. She also requested clarification as to whether the south side of Gilmer Avenue, N. E., and the south side of Patton Avenue, N. W., will be exempt from street collection, and asked that refuse collection be returned to the pre July 1, 2001 procedure.

At 5:24 p.m., the Mayor declared the meeting in recess to be immediately reconvened in the Emergency Operations Center Conference Room, Room 159, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke.

At 5:30 p.m., the meeting of Roanoke City Council reconvened in the Emergency Operations Center Conference Room, Room 159, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., with Mayor Ralph K. Smith presiding, and the following Members of Council in attendance, for the purpose of holding a joint session with the Roanoke Civic Center Commission to discuss expansion needs and special needs of the Roanoke Civic Center.

**PRESENT: Council Members W. Alvin Hudson, Jr., William White, Sr., Linda F. Wyatt, William D. Bestpitch, William H. Carder and Mayor Ralph K. Smith-----**

**--6.**

**ABSENT: Council Member C. Nelson Harris-----**

**1.**

**(Vice-Mayor Carder left the meeting following the presentation by the Manager of the Roanoke Civic Center.)**

**ROANOKE CIVIC CENTER COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Commissioners Vernon M. Danielsen, Mark E. Feldman, Edward L. Lambert, Robert C. Poole, Sandra W. Ryals and Calvin L. Johnson, Chair-----**

**-6.**

**ABSENT: Commissioner Thomas G. Powers-----**

**1.**

**STAFF PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; James D. Grisso, Director of Finance; Mary F. Parker, City Clerk; Rolanda A. Johnson, Assistant City Manager for Community Relations; Gary E. Tegankamp, Assistant City Attorney; James Evans, Manager, Roanoke Civic Center; Christene Powell, Assistant Manager, Roanoke Civic Center; and (Susan Bryant-Owens,) Secretary, Roanoke Civic Center Commission.**

**Following dinner, the business session convened at 6:00 p.m.**

**ROANOKE CIVIC CENTER-CONSULTANTS' REPORTS: Mr. Evans reviewed the results of a study prepared by Rosser International in October 1999, which provides for a \$64 million Civic Center expansion program. Components recommended by the architect include the following:**

**Two 32,500 square feet exhibit halls,**

**Private boxes on three sides of the coliseum,**

**Club seats/club lounge on the south side,**

Concourse renovation and expansion,  
 Seating bowl-aisle closure/seat replacement,  
 Restaurant/sports bar,  
 Additional seating - raise coliseum roof,  
 Improved back of house amenities,  
 Auditorium renovations,  
 Enclosure of plaza, and  
 Parking improvements.

Mr. Evans advised that issues with the exhibit hall include limited availability of weekend dates during prime season (October - April), with the coliseum used as an exhibit hall 45 days per year and lost business totaling \$85,000.00, or 16 event days. He stated that exhibit hall components include 32,000 square feet of open space, new kitchen facilities, new storage facilities, relocated cooling tower, ticket office and administrative office and a new truck dock/marshaling yard, at a total cost of \$13,065,000.00. He reviewed the following funding sources:

Exhibit Hall Cost	-	\$ 3,065,000.00
Additional Franchise Requirements		<u>1,276,020.00</u>
Total Project Costs		\$ 14,341,020.00
Operating Supplement Available for Capital Improvements		612,870.00
New Exhibit Hall Revenue		-
<u>150,000.00</u>		
		\$ 762,870.00
Available Serviceable Debt		8,391,570.00
Additional Debt Required		
5,949,450.00		



He also reviewed the following funding alternatives:

One per cent increase in Admissions Tax - \$ 114,389.00

(\$1.25 million in debt service)

One per cent increase in Meals Tax - \$ 1.5 million  
annually

(\$17 million in debt service)

One per cent in Lodging Tax - \$ 850,000.00

(\$10 million in debt service)

Mr. Evans reviewed other short term needs, as follows:

HVAC replacement (over six years) \$ 1,888,650.00

Auditorium 750,000.00

Fall Protection System 250,000.00

Side and End Court Risers 365,000.00

TOTAL \$ 3,253,650.00

At 6:15 p.m., Vice-Mayor Carder left the meeting.

The City Manager advised that the entertainment sports world views the City of Roanoke as a viable location which was indicated by recent decisions of the NBDL, SFX, and other entertainment venues; however, to this point, the Civic Center has not reached a level where the City can maximize its potential. She called attention to the National Basketball Development League (NBDL) franchise agreement, which, in anticipation of the possibility of the community expanding or

upgrading the facility, recognized the opportunity to promote naming rights and the idea of luxury boxes and suites, and if and when the NBDL becomes tenants and at such time as the City is ready to move forward in those areas, they are prepared to help identify individuals and corporations to assume those responsibilities. She added that if the City were to build the same facility to the specifications that are necessary to be competitive in today's market, the \$64 million figure projected by the consultant would triple. She stated that it is acknowledged that the City cannot fund a \$64 million project at one time, however, some components can be funded using a phased in approach and increased revenues from activities that would be returned to the Civic Center. She advised that Roanoke has the potential to become the entertainment center of southwest Virginia and the stadium/amphitheater project will help to promote that identification. She stated that Council is not requested to make decisions on revenue sources today; however, the briefing was presented in an effort to be responsive to the Council's request for information on exhibit hall space. She advised that in talking with representatives of the Roanoke Valley Convention and Visitors Bureau and the General Manager of The Hotel Roanoke, there are certain conferences and conventions that make a decision not to come to Roanoke because of insufficient exhibit hall space, which has a significant economic impact on the community. At the appropriate time, she requested that Council provide City staff with future direction which will enable the City of Roanoke to remain competitive with other localities.

There being no further business, at 6:45 p.m., the Mayor declared the meeting in recess to be reconvened at 7:00 p.m., in the City Council Chamber, fourth floor, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke.

On Monday, July 16, 2001, at 7:00 p.m., the Roanoke City Council reconvened in regular session in the City Council Chamber, fourth floor, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, with the following Council Members in attendance, Mayor Smith presiding.

**PRESENT:** Council Members W. Alvin Hudson, Jr., William White, Sr., Linda F. Wyatt, William D. Bestpitch, and Mayor

Ralph K. Smith-----  
--5.

ABSENT: Council Members William H. Carder and  
C. Nelson Harris-----  
--2.

OFFICERS PRESENT: Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William  
M. Hackworth, City Attorney; James D. Grisso, Director of Finance; and  
Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

The reconvened meeting was opened with a prayer by Council  
Member William D. Bestpitch.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of  
America was led by Mayor Smith.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**ZONING:** Pursuant to Resolution No. 25523 adopted by the  
Council on Monday, April 6, 1981, the City Clerk having advertised a  
public hearing for Monday, July 16, 2001, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon  
thereafter as the matter may be heard, on the request of Lee Hi Land  
Group, on the question of amending proffered conditions presently  
binding upon a tract of land lying on the north side of Orange Avenue,  
N. E., Official Tax No. 7140114, as set forth in Ordinance No. 33516-  
080497, adopted on August 4, 1997, the matter was before the body.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in  
The Roanoke Times on Friday, June 29, 2001 and Friday, July 6, 2001.

(See publisher's affidavit on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

A report of the City Planning Commission recommending that  
Council approve the request to amend proffered conditions, advising  
that amended conditions address inappropriate uses of the site as well  
as limiting the number of curb cuts to one, was before the body.

(For full text, see report on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

Mr. White offered the following ordinance:

**“AN ORDINANCE to amend §36.1-3 and 36.1-4, Code of the City of Roanoke (1979), as amended, and Sheet No. 714, Sectional 1976 Zone Map, City of Roanoke, in order to amend certain conditions presently binding upon certain property previously conditionally zoned C-2, General Commercial District, and dispensing with the second reading of this ordinance.”**

**Mr. White moved the adoption of the ordinance. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson.**

**Mr. Bestpitch expressed concern that neither the petitioner or his representative was present to respond to questions. He stated that in 1997, the property was rezoned from LM, Light Manufacturing District, to C-2, General Commercial District, subject to a development plan; however, sale of the property was not consummated and another party is now interested in purchasing the property.**

**He inquired as to the status of the development plan for review by City staff prior to Council’s amendment of the proffered conditions.**

**Mr. White offered a substitute motion that action on the matter be tabled inasmuch as the petitioner was not present to respond to questions. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted.**

**TAXES-BUSINESS INCUBATORS: Pursuant to action by the Council, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Monday, July 16, 2001, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, on the request of the Blue Ridge Small Business Development Center, Inc., d/b/a The New Century Venture Center, for designation of property located at 1354 Eighth Street, S. W., to be exempted from taxation, the matter was before the body.**

**Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in The Roanoke Times on Sunday, July 8, 2001.**

**(See publisher’s affidavit on file in the City Clerk’s Office.)**

**A communication from the City Manager advising that the Blue Ridge Small Business Center, Inc., owns property described as Official Tax Nos. 1130511, 1130512, 1130514, 1130515, 1130516, 1130719, 1130814, and 1130809, located at 1354 Eighth Street, S. W., which**

property houses The New Century Venture Center, an incubator for small businesses; annual taxes due for 2000-01 were \$4,561.68 on an assessed value of \$78,000.00 for the land and \$299,000.00 for the building; the Blue Ridge Small Business Center, Inc., petitioned Council in January 2001, for adoption of a resolution in support of the organization obtaining tax-exempt status from the General Assembly on property located in the City of Roanoke; loss of revenue to the City will be \$3,649.34 after a 20 per cent service charge is levied by the City in lieu of real estate taxes; and the service charge will be \$912.34, was before Council.

The City Manager recommended that Council support the request of the Blue Ridge Small Business Center, Inc., for exemption from taxation to the General Assembly, pursuant to Article X, Section 6(a)6 of the Constitution of Virginia.

(For full text, see communication on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

Mr. White offered the following resolution:

(#35481-071601) A RESOLUTION supporting tax exemption of certain property of the Blue Ridge Small Business Development Center, Inc., located in the City of Roanoke, an organization devoted exclusively to charitable or benevolent purposes on a non-profit basis.

(For full text of resolution, see Resolution Book No. 64.)

**ACTION:** Mr. White moved the adoption of Resolution No. 35481-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bestpitch.

Lisa Ison, President, The New Century Venture Center, advised that The New Century Venture Center is a business incubator that opened in July 1996 and operates as a 501 (C)(3) non-profit corporation, the sole mission of which is to nurture startup companies in the area and help them through the critical early steps of business development. She further advised that since its inception five years ago, the Center has assisted over 50 companies, graduated 12 companies and currently houses 23 tenants that employ 155 persons. She stated that the Center operates as a mixed use incubator by accepting companies involved in service, operations, high tech and light manufacturing

operations, and current occupants include 17 service companies, five high tech companies, one high tech light assembly operation and ten firms represent women or minority owned businesses. Of the 12 graduates, she noted that five have remained in the City of Roanoke and now employ 33 persons; two graduates purchased their own buildings and remodeled the structures into attractive facilities, thus encouraging surrounding business owners to update their properties; another graduate was acquired by a Colorado-based telecommunications company for \$13 million and because of the workforce and quality of life in the Roanoke Valley, a decision was made to remain in the Roanoke area and renovate a large facility, with creation of 40 additional high tech engineering jobs. She stated that in January 2001, The New Century Venture Center entered into a partnership with the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority to create an entrepreneur training program, the purpose of which is to identify existing and prospective individuals and entrepreneurs within the City's public housing development by helping them develop their businesses into viable operations; there are two on site participants and five additional participants are scheduled to enter the program. She explained that the small business incubator is a valuable part of Roanoke City's overall economic development program which fills a void for those entrepreneurs who may not have a chance otherwise and who need an environment that is conducive to business ownership, and it is rewarding to play an important role in assisting young companies that are starting to grow into successful business operations, which creating job opportunities for Roanoke's citizens. In closing, Ms. Ison stated that The New Century Venture Center does not receive funds through the City of Roanoke and if the tax exemption is approved, the Center will continue to pay an amount equal to 20 per cent of the City's real estate tax levy.

Mr. White spoke in support of the request of The New Century Venture Center; however, he called attention to previous requests that City staff review the status of 501(C)(3) non-profit corporations to provide Council with a review of current properties on the City's tax role versus tax exempt properties, and submit a policy recommendation for consideration by Council.

The Mayor expressed concern with regard to the precedent of granting tax exempt status, and stated that he would prefer some type of allotment to the organization as opposed to opening the door to tax exempt status.

The City Manager advised that this is an area that warrants scrutiny; a previous Council enacted a policy that applicants agree to pay 20 per cent of what would be the normal real estate tax, and previous to that decision, tax exempt agencies were not required to pay any real estate taxes; therefore, there are two different categories of tax exempt status in the City of Roanoke. She spoke in support of the request of The New Century Venture Center because it contributes directly to the economy of the City of Roanoke. Pursuant to the request of Council Member White, she advised that she would evaluate the current procedure for real estate tax exemption and provide a policy recommendation for consideration by Council.

Resolution No. 35481-071601 was adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch,  
and Mayor Smith-----  
-5.

NAYS: None-----  
--0.

(Council Members Carder and Harris were absent.)

The Mayor declared the public hearing closed.

**CITY PROPERTY-PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS:** Pursuant to action taken by Council, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Monday, July 16, 2001, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, on the request of the City of Roanoke to convey approximately 1,000 square feet, more or less, of City-owned property located in Garden City Park, described as a strip of land approximately 100' x 10' between the creek and the rear property line of Official Tax No. 4390812, being a portion of Official Tax No. 4390619, to Cheryl Marie Proctor Chandler, 3655 Ventnor Road, S. E., upon certain terms and conditions, the matter was before the body.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in The Roanoke Times on Sunday, July 8, 2001.

(See publisher's affidavit on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

**ACTION:** Due to an error in property description, the City Manager requested that the matter be withdrawn.

Without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that the matter would be withdrawn.

**BONDS/BOND ISSUES-WATER RESOURCES-SIDEWALK, CURB AND GUTTER-STADIUM-SCHOOLS:** Pursuant to action of the Council, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Monday, July 16, 2001, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, with respect to the proposed adoption of a resolution authorizing the City of Roanoke to contract a debt and to issue general obligation public improvement bonds of the City and in anticipation of the issuance thereof general obligation public improvement bond anticipation notes of the City, in the principal amount of \$31,245,000.00, for the purpose of providing funds to pay the costs of acquisition, construction, reconstruction, improvement, extension, enlargement and equipping of various public improvement projects of and for the City, the matter was before the body.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in The Roanoke Times on Monday, July 2, 2001 and Monday, July 9, 2001.

(See publisher's affidavit on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

The City Manager and the Director of Finance submitted a joint written report advising that on June 18, 2001, Council endorsed and concurred in recommendations contained in an update to the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for Fiscal Years 2002-2006, which included a list of new capital improvement projects and funding scenarios; and consistent with recommendations in the Capital Improvements Program update, the following capital projects contained in the updated plan need to be funded by the next issuance of bonds, pursuant to the Public Finance Act of 1991 (Code of Virginia):

Crystal Spring Water Filtration Plant	\$ 5,445,000.00
Curb, Gutter and Sidewalk Program	5,000,000.00
Schools	4,600,000.00
Stadium/Amphitheater	<u>16,200,000.00</u>



**Total**

**\$ 31,245,000.00**

**The City Manager and the Director of Finance recommended that Council adopt a measure authorizing issuance of \$31,245,000.00 general obligation bonds, pursuant to the Public Finance Act of 1991 (Code of Virginia).**

**(For full text, see report on file in the City Clerk's Office.)**

**Mr. Bestpitch offered the following resolution:**

**“A RESOLUTION authorizing the issuance of thirty-one million two hundred forty-five thousand dollars (\$31,245,000) principal amount of general obligations of the City of Roanoke, Virginia, in the form of general obligation public improvement bonds of such City, for the purpose of providing funds to pay the costs of the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, improvement, extension, enlargement and equipping of various public improvement projects of and for such City; fixing the form, denomination and certain other details of such bonds; providing for the sale of such bonds; authorizing the preparation of a preliminary official statement and an official statement relating to such bonds and the distribution thereof and the execution of a certificate relating to such official statement; authorizing the execution and delivery of a continuing disclosure certificate relating to such bonds; authorizing and providing for the issuance and sale of a like principal amount of general obligation public improvement bond anticipation notes in anticipation of the issuance and sale of such bonds; and otherwise providing with respect to the issuance, sale and delivery of such bonds and notes.”**

**ACTION: Mr. Bestpitch moved the adoption of the resolution. The motion was seconded by Mr. White.**

**Mr. Hudson advised that he supports the need for general obligation bonds; however, in good conscience, he could not support a \$31 million bond issue without providing an opportunity for citizen input through a bond referendum.**

**Mr. Bestpitch referred to the \$5 million allocated for curb, gutter and sidewalk improvements and called attention to those citizens who**

have waited for many years for funds to be dedicated for that purpose. He stated that \$5 million will take the City a long way in reaching its goals and encouraged Council Members to vote in favor of issuing the bonds.

Mr. White advised that the \$5 million designated for sidewalk, curb and gutter improvements is a major step forward, and one of his priorities during his Council service has been to improve the City's financial condition in order to fund such improvements.

Ms. Wyatt advised that a portion of the bond funds are designated for the Roanoke City Public School System, and inasmuch as she teaches at a City elementary school, she inquired if she should abstain from voting on the resolution; whereupon, the City Attorney advised that since the proposed measure pertains to capital expenditures at the Roanoke Academy for Mathematics and Science, Ms. Wyatt would not have a conflict of interest and could therefore cast her vote on the resolution.

The Mayor requested information on the City's bonded indebtedness. He stated that old debt is being retired at the rate of about \$3 million per year and the proposed \$31 million bond issue is in addition to funds that will be necessary for the two high school renovation projects, as well as civic center improvements in the range of \$64 million over the next several years. He inquired as to the bonded indebtedness of the previous Council and the present Council, and stated that the City must retire debt at a faster pace if it is to continue to expand the City's bonded indebtedness. He requested information on the City's level of bonded indebtedness five years ago.

The Director of Finance responded to the City's level of bonded indebtedness over the past three years; i.e.: on June 30, 1999, the City and the School Board had \$119 million in general obligation bond debt, \$77 million City debt and \$42 million school debt; on June 30, 2000, the City had a \$99 million debt and the Schools had \$58 million, for a total of \$157 million; and as of June 30, 2001, the City will have \$94 million outstanding debt and the School debt will be \$61 million, for a total of \$155 million. He stated that the principle reduction in bonded debt for next year for the City and School budget totals approximately \$9 million,

**\$6 million to be retired by the City and \$3 million to be retired by the School Board.**

**Inasmuch as general obligation bond resolutions require four affirmative votes for adoption, the resolution was lost by the following vote:**

**AYES: Council Members White, Wyatt and Bestpitch-----3.**

**NAYS: Council Member Hudson-----**  
**1.**

**(Mayor Smith voted present, which he later clarified as an abstention.)**

**(Council Members Carder and Harris were absent.)**

**The Mayor declared the public hearing closed.**

**Later during the meeting, Mr. Bestpitch raised a point of order in connection with the impact of the public hearing on the general obligation bond issue, and inquired as to the status of bond projects and how the matter can be brought back to the Council floor for a vote.**

**In clarification, the Mayor advised that his abstention on the resolution was based on the fact that he did not receive a satisfactory response to his question regarding the City's bonded indebtedness.**

**The City Attorney advised that the matter can be brought back to the Council floor by the City Manager; however, he will confer with bond counsel on the question of whether another public hearing must be legally advertised and conducted by Council.**

**Ms. Wyatt spoke in support of an information sharing briefing by the City Manager and the Director of Finance in connection with methods used by other municipalities in the Commonwealth of Virginia to fund large types of capital improvements, the level and term(s) of indebtedness, bond rating, etc., and how the City of Roanoke compares with other municipalities of comparable size.**

**CITY PROPERTY-BLUE CROSS/BLUE SHIELD:** Pursuant to instructions by Council, the City Clerk having advertised a public hearing for Monday, July 16, 2001, at 7:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, on a proposal of the City of Roanoke to convey to Trigon Insurance Company certain City owned property identified as Official Tax Nos. 4016001, also known as Key Plaza, and 4016003, located on Franklin Road, S. W., the matter was before the body.

Legal advertisement of the public hearing was published in The Roanoke Times on Sunday, July 8, 2001.

(See publisher's affidavit on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

A communication from the City Manager advising that Trigon Insurance Company (Trigon), successor in interest to Blue Cross of Southwest Virginia and Blue Shield of Southwest Virginia, is the owner of a multi-story office building located on Official Tax No. 4016002 at the corner of Franklin Road and Jefferson Street in downtown Roanoke; adjacent parcels to the building, Official Tax Nos. 4016001 (Key Plaza) and 4016003, are both owned by the City of Roanoke; the City is solely responsible for maintenance and upkeep of these areas and for repairs to Key Plaza; Trigon has offered to purchase Key Plaza and Official Tax No. 4016003 for the purchase price of \$100.00, thereby relieving the City of its continuing obligations to maintain both parcels; proper maintenance of the two parcels of land would be insured and subject to routine and customary real estate taxation by the City; and Trigon has agreed that the Special Warranty Deed conveying the parcels of land to Trigon shall require that, unless the City agrees, Trigon and its successors shall continue to use and maintain the parcels of land as a plaza or open area, was before Council.

The City Manager recommended that she be authorized to execute a deed and any other appropriate documents to be approved as to form by the City Attorney, to transfer Official Tax Nos. 4016001 and 4016003 to Trigon Insurance Company.

(For full text, see communication on file in the City Clerk's Office.)

**Mr. White offered the following ordinance:**

(#35482-071601) AN ORDINANCE authorizing the City Manager to execute the necessary documents providing for the sale and conveyance of certain City-owned parcels located at or near 111 Franklin Road, S. W., and at the intersection of Franklin Road and Jefferson Street, bearing Official Tax No. 4016001 (Key Plaza) and Official Tax No. 4016003, upon certain terms and conditions, and dispensing with the second reading of this ordinance.

(For full text of ordinance, see Ordinance Book No. 64.)

**ACTION:** Mr. White moved the adoption of Ordinance No. 35482-071601. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

**AYES:** Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch, and Mayor Smith-----  
-5.

**NAYS:** None-----  
--0.

(Council Members Carder and Harris were absent.)

The Mayor declared the public hearing closed.

**OTHER HEARING OF CITIZENS:**

The Mayor advised that this is a time for citizens to be heard; and matters requiring referral to the City Manager will be referred immediately for response, report or recommendation to Council.

**COMPLAINTS-REFUSE COLLECTION-RECYCLING:** Mr. Woodrow Hickman, 1010 Norfolk Avenue, S. W., appeared before Council in connection with refuse collection in his section of the City which has not been collected for approximately three weeks. He expressed concern for elderly and disabled persons who are physically unable to push their refuse containers to the street for collection, and because of the topography of the land with high embankments, refuse collection is best served from the alley. He stated that sanitation workers are under paid, the department is understaffed and more employees are

needed to render the service. He complained about the accumulation of debris and weeds on the property of a business located in his neighborhood, the property owner does not live in the area, therefore, the condition of the property has caused a decrease in property value for other property owners in the neighborhood.

**POLICE DEPARTMENT-COMPLAINTS-CITY SHERIFF-COMMONWEALTH'S ATTORNEY:** Jeff Artis, Chair, Roanoke Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), 1450 Lafayette Boulevard, N. W., advised that the SCLC has a history of pro law enforcement. However, he stated that on Friday, July 13, 2001, the SCLC completed an investigation of alleged police brutality, one involving the Sheriff's Department and one involving the Roanoke City Police Department, both of which related to individuals residing at the Roanoke Rescue Mission who were arrested for intoxication in public. He added that one of the individuals, while in custody of the Sheriff's Department, reported that he was hand cuffed and slammed into the bars of his jail cell, suffering bodily injury and beaten by law enforcement personnel; and another individual, while in custody of the Roanoke City Police Department, reported bodily injury and also beaten by law enforcement personnel. He added that further research conducted by the SCLC finds that as of Friday, July 13, the proper documents concerning these alleged police beatings had not been properly filed, indicating a possible cover up, and photographs of the victims will be posted on his web-site. He stated that as an organization, the SCLC does not support police brutality or misconduct, and in light of these two alleged cases of police brutality and other information gathered by the SCLC over the past several years regarding Roanoke's law enforcement personnel, the SCLC will formally ask the U. S. Department of Justice to investigate all Roanoke City law enforcement agencies, including the Roanoke City Police Department, Sheriff's Department, and Commonwealth Attorney's Office.

Jack Mills, 1400 Irving Road, Thaxton, Virginia, Ombudsman for the Commonwealth of Virginia for Women, Children and Minorities, as appointed by National Southern Christian Leadership Conference President, Herbert Coulton, advised that the purpose of his position is to diffuse difficult situations in the community in an effort to develop harmony. He stated that he was requested by the President of the Roanoke Chapter, SCLC, to support Mr. Artis in his presentation before

Council, and suggested that a Member of Council convene a meeting of appropriate persons to talk “with” each other rather than “to” each other with regard to alleged actions of law enforcement personnel in the City of Roanoke.

**SPECIAL PERMITS:** Mr. Preston Moore, 435 Willow Oak Drive, S. W., advised that he has been informed by City Building Inspectors that a basketball goal erected on City right-of-way and without the permission of Council, which faces his property on Willow Oak Drive, must be removed. He stated that the basketball goal was erected prior to his acquisition of the property which is located on a cul de sac, and requested a special exception by the City to permit the basketball goal to encroach on City right-of-way.

**COMPLAINTS-TAXES-CITY EMPLOYEES:** Mr. Robert Gravely, 617 Hanover Avenue, N. W., addressed Council with regard to City issues of concern, specifically, insufficient wages for the City workforce and the high real estate tax rate in the City of Roanoke which makes it difficult, if not impossible, for the average City worker to purchase a home.

**COMPLAINTS-STREETS AND ALLEYS:** Mr. George Gunther, P. O. Box 12353, expressed concern with regard to alley closings in the City of Roanoke which will eliminate rear access to private residences, in some instances, by emergency vehicles. Instead of closing the alleys, he suggested that alleys be widened to allow for improved access and cleared of debris to eliminate health and safety hazards.

At 8:10 p.m., the Mayor declared the meeting in recess for one closed session.

At 8:30 p.m., the meeting reconvened in the City Council Chamber, with all Members of the Council in attendance, except Council Members Carder and Harris, Mayor Smith presiding.

**ACTION:** **COUNCIL:** With respect to the Closed Meeting just concluded, Mr. Bestpitch moved that each Member of City Council certify to the best of his or her knowledge that: (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and (2) only such public business matters

as were identified in any motion by which any Closed Meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered by City Council. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hudson and adopted by the following vote:

AYES: Council Members Hudson, White, Wyatt, Bestpitch,  
and Mayor Smith-----  
-5.

NAYS: None-----  
--0.

(Council Members Carder and Harris were absent.)

At 8:32 p.m., the Mayor declared the meeting in recess until Monday, July 30, 2001, at 12:15 p.m., in the Emergency Operations Center Conference Room, Room 159, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke.



The regular meeting of Roanoke City Council which convened on Monday, July 16, 2001, and declared in recess until Monday, July 30, 2001, was called to order on July 30, at 12:15 p.m., in the Emergency Operations Center Conference Room, Room 159, Noel C. Taylor Municipal Building, 215 Church Avenue, S. W., City of Roanoke, by Mayor Ralph K. Smith.

**PRESENT:** Council Members W. Alvin Hudson, Jr., William White, Sr., Linda F. Wyatt, William D. Bestpitch, William H. Carder, C. Nelson Harris, and Mayor Ralph K. Smith-----  
---7.

**ABSENT:** None-----  
--0.

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Darlene L. Burcham, City Manager; William M. Hackworth, City Attorney; James D. Grisso, Director of Finance; and Mary F. Parker, City Clerk.

In view of the fact that a number of persons were present out of their interest in one or more briefing items on the agenda, following discussion, it was the consensus of Council that the fifth Monday of each month will be conducted as a work session of the Council and citizens are invited to attend the meetings, but will not be recognized for comments.

Inasmuch as one citizen had previously registered to speak, the Mayor called upon Mr. Douglas Woody, 4854 Autumn Lane, N. W., who spoke against the closing of the fire station on Salem Turnpike, N. W. He referred to copy of an annexation decree dated June 6, 1975, which provides for a fire station in the Salem Turnpike area.

**COUNCIL-COMMITTEES:** Council having previously agreed that a portion of each fifth Monday work session would be reserved for Council Members to report on their liaison roles to various Council-Appointed authorities, boards, commissions and committees, Members of Council presented the following reports.

Vice-Mayor Carder, Council's liaison to Downtown Roanoke, Inc. (DRI) reported that the Outlook Roanoke Plan has gone through three updates and should be released in the near future and DRI is trying to build support for downtown development through the Plan. He stated that Downtown Roanoke, Inc., recently relocated to the City Market area and hired a full time manager to address marketing of the City Market. He further stated that the "Big Lick" street sweeper is in operation in downtown Roanoke; and DRI is working on developing the Zimmerman

property in conjunction with the Roanoke Valley Chamber of Commerce and the Foundation for Downtown Roanoke, Inc.

He advised that of concern is the fact that Downtown Service District tax collection has remained relatively flat over the last six to seven years, especially in view of downtown development.

Vice-Mayor Carder reported that the Virginia Museum of Transportation is conducting a Museum Assessment Program in order to become a certified museum which should be completed by October 8; major emphasis is on the construction of a new canopy which will be funded by TEA-21 money and City involvement; and the Transportation Museum is constructing an automobile gallery through private contributions.

Vice-Mayor Carder advised that the Roanoke Valley Convention and Visitor's Bureau would like to compliment Roanoke City Council and the City administration on increasing the City's lodging tax, the proceeds of which are to be used to increase advertising and marketing of the Roanoke area. He stated that the RVCVB is working to implement a strategic plan to raise the visibility of the Convention and Visitor's Bureau and to increase the awareness of the benefits of tourism and marketing tourism dollars. He advised that the RVCVB received a \$10,000.00 grant for the African-American Heritage tour and two additional trade shows have been added in an effort to generate more convention business; City-wide hotel occupancy is currently at 53 per cent which is low compared with the national average of approximately 65 per cent; and two new hotels will be locating in the Roanoke area in the near future. He stated that Roanoke County has increased its funding for RVCVB from \$112,000.00 to \$150,000.00, the City of Salem increased its contributions to \$10,000.00 and Franklin County increased its contribution from \$2,500.00 to \$5,000.00.

He advised that the Special Events Committee continues to focus on The Christmas Tree Lighting Ceremony, Dickens of a Christmas, the St. Patrick's Day Parade, and the Blues and Jazz Festival.

Mr. Hudson advised that he serves as Council's liaison to the Roanoke Civic Center Commission and called attention to a briefing on July 16 with regard to future

needs of the Civic Center totaling \$64 million. He stated that he serves as liaison to the Roanoke Valley Cable Television Committee which is currently working on a new franchise agreement with Cox Communications; he serves on the Virginia CARES Board of Directors which works to bring inmates back into the community through job placement; and he also serves on the Virginia Municipal League Transportation Safety Committee, as well as Council's liaison to the Mayor's Committee for People with Disabilities.

Ms. Wyatt advised that she serves as Council's liaison to the America's Roanoke's Promise Board of Directors and the Roanoke Neighborhood Development Corporation (RNDC). She commended the work of the City Manager and the Director of Finance who were of assistance to RNDC through difficult times, and advised that RNDC has met its fund raising goal of \$75,000.00.

Mr. Bestpitch advised that he serves on the Roanoke Neighborhood Partnership Steering Committee as Council's liaison. He commended the work of the new Neighborhood Coordinator and the new Assistant City Manager for Community Development and stated that the City can look forward to a strong and healthy relationship with its neighborhoods. He noted that on September 21 - 22, the City of Roanoke will host the State Neighborhood Conference at the Holiday Inn Tanglewood, and invited Council Members to participate in the Conference. He advised that he also serves on the Mill Mountain Zoo Board of Directors, the Zoo is celebrating its 50th anniversary this year and the Board of Directors is working on a long range master plan to upgrade and expand Zoo operations and to improve certain areas of the Zoo, and there may be pertinent funding issues to be addressed in the future as Council moves through the budget process. He explained that the Mill Mountain Zoo lease is about to expire and with major investments and a major capital fund drive, the Board of Directors of the Mill Mountain Zoo is interested in a longer term lease arrangement with the City.

Council Member Harris advised that he serves as Council's liaison to the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority Board of Commissioners. He stated that Council has been briefed on the Lincoln 2000 Project and GOB North and South projects. He called attention to monthly meetings with John Baker, Executive Director, and Willis Anderson, Chairperson, Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority and advised that if Council Members have questions or concerns, he will be pleased to bring these matters to the attention of Mr. Baker and Mr. Anderson.

Council Member White advised that he Chairs the Audit Committee and the Legislative Committee and both committees presented Council with written annual reports. He commended the City Attorney for his assistance with legislative matters and the Municipal Auditor, for his assistance with audit matters. He advised that

**Mr. Bird will retire on September 30, 2001, as Municipal Auditor and commended him on his outstanding service to the City of Roanoke.**

**The Mayor advised that he serves as ex officio to all Council-Appointed committees. He reported on the Mill Mountain Advisory Committee and advised that since its inception in the 1960's, only two persons have served as Chair until recently when Carl H. Koptizke resigned his position as Chair, but will continue to serve as a member of the committee. He requested that a measure be prepared commending Mr. Koptizke on his many years of service and his contributions as Chair of the Mill Mountain Advisory Committee.**

**The Mayor advised that he will present his State of the City Address on Tuesday, August 7, an invitation was extended to all Members of Council to share their ideas for inclusion in the document, and encouraged Council Members to submit their responses by the close the business day.**

**He stated that the Mayor's Technology Committee is meeting with communications personnel and plans to present an in-depth report to Council in the near future.**

#### **CITY MANAGER BRIEFINGS:**

**FIRE-EMS: The City Manager introduced a briefing on the Fire/EMS Department Strategic Business Plan 2000-2007. She called attention to discussions during fiscal year 2001-02 budget study, in which several members of Council challenged City staff to review resource allocations and to explore the question of whether there is an opportunity through a regional effort to better respond to certain parts of the community; whereupon, she called upon Chief James Grigsby to present the briefing.**

**Chief Grigsby advised that there are 14 fire stations in the City of Roanoke and each fire station should cover approximately seven square miles which is used as a guideline. He explained that major areas of the seven year plan include:**

#### **Fire Suppression:**

**A goal of reducing life and dollar loss to the community,**

**New station construction,**

**Standards of response coverage,**

**Employee safety, and**

**Mutual response and aid with surrounding jurisdictions.**

**Emergency Medical Services:**

**Grow advance life support personnel to 45,**

**Monitor service demands and make recommendations for changes in resource needs, (unit system status approach), and**

**Evaluate EMS user fee structure and make recommendations in parallel with Medicare fee structure enhancements.**

**Fire Prevention and Investigation:**

**Fire protection engineer,**

**Increase fire business inspections,**

**Mail Code compliance,**

**Increase public education,**

**New fall program - RISK WATCH:**

**Pre-school thru fifth grade, and**

**Coordinate with Standards of Learning.**

**Fire-EMS Training:**

**Conduct training needs analysis,**

**Increase contact hours,**

**Regional training,**

**Implementation of a training bureau concept, and**

**Identify additional training resources.**

**Apparatus and Equipment Maintenance:**

Explore regional maintenance concept,

Contract out specialized needs, and

E. G. Aerial Ladder Maintenance.

**Technology:**

New Fire-EMS records management system - computerized incident reporting,

GIS-GEO,

Mobile data terminals - voiceless communications, and

Automatic vehicle locator system.

**ISO (Insurance Service Organization) Class 3 City:**

July 16 thru July 27 (conduct evaluation),

Ongoing review of service levels, and

Help identify areas needing improvement,

Fire

Water system

9 - 1 - 1.

He stated that the Fire/EMS Department is preparing for national accreditation which is fairly new for fire service, currently there are less than 50 departments in the United States that are nationally accredited and the City of Roanoke Fire/EMS would like to be accredited by the end of fiscal year 2001-02.

He advised that there are currently 14 fire stations, 275 personnel, 13 engines, four ladders, and six medic units, a required daily staffing at 64 individuals on duty in the operational divisions, responding to 90 per cent of the City's population in

under four minutes, and ems calls to 92 per cent of life threatening calls in under eight minutes. He reviewed the following performance measures:

**Fire:**

Four minutes 90 per cent of the time to all structure fires,

Eight minutes 90 per cent of the time to all other types of fire incidents,  
and

13 personnel on initial response to all structure fires.

**EMS:**

Eight minutes 90 per cent of the time to all life threatening medical emergencies, and

Twelve minutes 90 per cent of the time to all non-life threatening medical emergencies.

He reviewed the sequence of events that may occur from ignition to suppression of a fire; .i.e.: detection of the fire and report of the fire which are indirectly manageable; receive process call 9 - 1 - 1 (one minute), turn out (one minute) and travel from station to scene (four minutes) which are directly manageable; and scene controlled. He noted that the following are examples of calls for service:

**Fire:**

House and building fires,

Fire alarm activations,

Car fires,

Brush and trash fires,

Chemical hazards,

Technical rescues, and

Aircraft incidents.

**EMS:**

**Heart attacks/strokes,**

**Assaults/shootings,**

**Car accidents,**

**Falls/construction and industrial accidents,**

**Diabetes/allergic reactions,**

**OB deliveries, and**

**Other medical emergencies.**

He explained that 80 per cent of calls are medical related and 18 per cent are fire related, there are 17 front line apparatus to handle the 18 per cent of calls and six front line ambulances to handle 79 per cent of calls; there are approximately 110 - 115 working fires per year, and for the period of January 2000 - June 2001, there were 155 working fires in the City of Roanoke. He stated that the definition of a working fire is the first responding fire apparatus arriving on the scene does a size up which determines if it is a working or non-working fire, i.e.: is smoke coming out of the windows. He further stated that in a typical working fire, 12 - 15 people are needed to handle tasks and the average is 18.6 people on each working fire; and there are approximately 15,000 engine calls with about 10,000 of the calls representing non-patient transports.

Chief Grigsby reviewed factors that determined the need for station construction/relocation:

**Location:**

**Performance Measures (four minute window),**

**Population (Density, age),**

**Major transportation infrastructure improvements,**



**Calls per fire zone district (high life hazard vs. low life hazard),**

**Facility type, condition and age,**

**Bay size to accommodate modern apparatus,**

**Gender issues, and**

**Useful life as a fire station.**

**He reviewed a chart on fire station status containing information on the year of construction, current condition, size, location, life expectancy, action needed and estimated cost/repair based on a building condition assessment prepared by Balzer and Associates dated October, 1999.**

**He reviewed a three phase building plan, i.e.: Phase I involves consolidation of Stations 1 and 3, with architectural, engineering and land acquisition to occur the first year and construction during the second year. He explained that Station 1 is located on Church Avenue, S. W., and Station 3 is located on Sixth Street, S. W. He stated that benefits provide that a single station, properly located, can serve this area within the required four minute response time 90 per cent, size and ability to accommodate modern equipment, a facility for fire-ems administration, and gender accommodation. He explained that the area recommended for Station No. 1 relocation is in the vicinity of Elm Avenue, S. W. (Williamson Road corridor).**

**Chief Grigsby advised that Phase II would consolidate Station Nos. 5 and 9; Station 5 is currently located at 12th Street and Loudon Avenue and Station 9 is located at Melrose Avenue and 24<sup>th</sup> Street; the second year of the plan would involve architectural, engineering and land acquisition and the third year would include construction. He stated that benefits include: one station properly located can service this area within the required four minute response time 90 per cent; aerial ladder apparatus can be relocated; there would be an ability to accommodate modern equipment; employee safety; gender accommodation and provide additional service to the community through police satellite offices and multi-use facilities. He explained that Phase III construction recommends that a station be built on upper north Williamson Road which would be Station No. 10, and is an airport station which is in good condition, with good sides, with a five to 20 year life expectancy, and reasons for the recommendation are twofold, i.e.: the airport is desirous of building a new station as envisioned in its master plan to meet Federal Aviation Administration requirements, and to locate a station on north Williamson Road which is an underserved part of the City. He stated that benefits include increased response**

coverage of under four minutes to an additional three per cent of the population, to meet FAA requirements, and to provide increased service to upper Williamson Road and the northeast area.

Chief Grigsby advised that working in conjunction with his counterparts in Roanoke County and the City of Salem, three recommendations are submitted for Council's consideration:

**Recommendation No. 1:**

**Staffing:**

Six positions to No. 4 station, 3763 Peters Creek Road, and place an additional ambulance unit in service,

Dedicate more resources to 80 per cent service calls,

Provide underserved area with faster ambulance response times,

Provide back-up to one of the busiest ambulances in the system,

Reduce fire engine "first responder" calls, keeping them more available for fire emergencies,

Area can be served by Fire Station No. 4 and No. 13 to provide four minute/90 per cent fire response, and

Low demand for service area (run demand by engine company).

**Regional Cooperation:**

Automatic aid with the City of Salem to provide a fire engine from their Fire Station No. 2 (419 and Salem Turnpike) to City fire zones No. 5 and No. 8 (area immediately north and south of Salem Turnpike from City line to Peters Creek Road). The City will provide a fire engine to Salem - west to 419, north Route 11 and South Veterans Medical Center.

**Recommendation No. 2:**

**Staffing:**

Six positions to Roanoke County Clearbrook Fire Station (220 South) to help cross staff one engine and one ambulance,

Provide 220 South/Southern Hills area with faster response times for both fire and ambulance,

Provide four minute/90 per cent fire response to underserved area which is growing commercially, and

Reduces City's longest response time.

**Regional cooperation:**

Roanoke County will assign 12 full time employees; Roanoke City will assign six full time employees; combined resources of 18 full time employees, staffing needed for one engine and one ambulance,

seven day/24 hour coverage,

Paid to paid staff,

County apparatus, and

Cost sharing details to be worked out by respective administrations.

There was discussion with regard to an annexation decree in which certain commitments were made when the Salem Turnpike area was annexed to the City; whereupon, it was the consensus of Council that the City Attorney would research the annexation decree and provide Council with an opinion as to whether the City has honored the terms of the annexation agreement.

**Recommendation No. 3:**

When construction Phase II (northwest section) is completed in approximately three years, 12 positions will become available for reallocation. Fire administration recommends taking no action on these positions until future service levels are analyzed, then bringing a detailed recommendation for Council's consideration.

He presented a status table of fire stations in their current condition and station status after business plan implementation in 2007; and presented the following cost breakdown:

Phase I	-	\$4,700,000.00
Phase II	-	2,575,000.00
Phase III	-	<u>1,555,000.00</u>
Total	-	\$8,830,000.00

He advised that re-use of existing stations could be as follows:

Fire Station No. 1 - Partner with Julian-Stanley Wise Foundation to develop into a fire/rescue museum.

Fire Station Nos. 3, 5, and 9 - Several community groups have expressed an interest in attaining buildings for neighborhood use.

A summary of questions and/or comments by Council Members is as follows:

The difference between a Class 3 and a Class 2 City as rated by the Insurance Service Organization, and the City's goal to improve its rating to Class 2.

Response times/Station location;

Staff retirements in the next six months;

A request for information covering the last six months response time on each call for assistance, broken down by fire station.

The question of whether a majority of the area proposed for consolidation of Fire Station No. 1 is located in historic old southwest.

If \$51,420.00, which is the estimated repair cost for Fire Station No. 5, is approved, what would be the life expectancy of the fire station?

The dollar amount of \$62,000.00 for an elevator for Fire Station No. 5 seems high.

**Additional costs incurred for community rooms that are constructed as a part of a public facility.**

**Has the City of Salem approved Recommendation No. 1? What steps need to be taken to formalize the agreement? Has the proposal been presented to residents of the Ridgewood Park area? The City Manager responded that the next step will be for the jurisdictions to create a formal document that would then be adopted by the two localities, followed by presentations to various civic groups.**

**Roanoke City and Roanoke County should not start down this path unless the two localities are serious about regional cooperation, thereby making this the first step in a gradual incremental process whereby Roanoke City Fire and EMS and Roanoke County Fire and Rescue Services are combined into one Roanoke Valley department.**

**While discussing regionalism for Fire/EMS services, the localities should begin to discuss police services.**

**City staff should immediately brief Ridgewood Park residents on the proposed recommendations and provide Council with a summary of response(s).**

**There being no further questions or comments, without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that the briefing would be received and filed.**

**COMMUNITY PLANNING-COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: The City Manager advised that City staff, citizens and Council have spent considerable time engaged in the process of updating the City's Comprehensive Plan, Vision 2001. She stated that as the process comes to a close, City staff would like to brief Council on the status of the plan before the joint public hearing before Council and the City Planning Commission on August 20 to be followed by subsequent adoption of the plan by both bodies. She requested the opportunity to highlight those issues within the plan that are the most significant or controversial, or those issues that might require the greatest change in the community for the future. She stated that following adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, the Zoning Ordinance will be revised which will involve major implementation of many of the changes that are reflected in the Comprehensive Plan.**

**Evelyn S. Lander, Director, Community Planning, reviewed key components of the new Comprehensive Plan that have been developed over the past year with substantial public involvement. She called attention to a joint public hearing by City Council and the City Planning Commission which is scheduled for Monday, August 20, 2001, which means that final revisions will have to occur within the next**

two weeks in order to present the document for public review before the August 20 public hearing. She presented the following information on plan themes which are critical to the success of the new Comprehensive Plan:

Regionalism is the key to addressing many of the goals and recommended policies of the plan. Council's continued leadership will be needed to move regional items forward and collaborate with other governmental officials.

Partnerships are essential to the plan because government cannot do it alone. Citizens, businesses, and civic organizations must take an active role in helping to achieve the recommendations of the plan.

Economic development initiatives are fundamental to both the economy and quality of life of the City and the region. Diverse economic development is the basis for housing opportunities and a sustainable population.

Protecting and enhancing Roanoke's environment is critical to maintaining its quality of life and encouraging economic development.

Housing opportunities must be enhanced in the City to provide better housing choices for a diversity of residents and incomes.

The design of buildings, streets, and developments must be of high quality that enhance the community. City government needs to provide leadership in encouraging development that creates a beautiful and attractive City.

Ms. Lander advised that key recommendations from the Housing and Neighborhoods section of the plan include:

One of the key recommended strategies for moving the City forward is to look at the City neighborhoods as villages that are served by small commercial centers. Raleigh Court and South Roanoke neighborhoods have vibrant community centers. Henry Street once provided such a center to the Gainsboro neighborhood. The plan identifies several neighborhood centers and recommends appropriate commercial and mixed housing opportunities around these centers. It is important to point out that the creation of these centers may result in the redevelopment of some existing neighborhood areas- -some demolition

of existing residential buildings may have to be done to provide for new mixed use development.

A strong emphasis is placed on creating new housing opportunities in the City—both in the choice of housing types and in the price ranges. It is important that citizens have choices in housing for all neighborhoods and that neighborhoods provide a range of homes, from affordable to high end.

Neighborhood plans will continue to be done for all City neighborhoods. Approximately one-third of the City has been studied and plans developed—some of which

w i l l  
b e  
comin  
g  
before  
Coun  
cil in  
t h e  
n e a r  
future

.  
These  
plans  
w i l l  
compl  
ement  
t h e  
Comp  
rehen  
s i v e  
Plan  
a n d  
make  
more  
detail

e d  
recom  
mend  
ations  
regar  
ding  
specif  
ic  
strate  
gies  
and  
zonin  
g  
patter  
ns.

Environmental resources include greenways, mountain viewsheds, trees, historic resources and air and water quality. Specifically, the City and the region's environmental resources are very important to the City's quality of life and its future. In particular, greenways, viewsheds, and trees were identified as critical to Roanoke's future. The preservation and enhancement of historic properties is critical to understanding Roanoke's sense of place and its past history. Already, the City has seen controversy in some of its past policies regarding historic neighborhoods. However, it is important to note that the City Market and Roanoke's historic neighborhoods have been successful economic investment tools. Air and water quality is increasingly more important to Roanoke's future sustainability. New protection regulations will not be easy to deal with, but are very much needed to have quality air and water now and in the future.

The economic development plan element includes an expanded economic base, redevelopment of underutilized sites, town village centers and regional efforts. More specifically, economic development is fundamental to achieving the goals set forth in the Comprehensive Plan. The plan recommends an expanded economic base that targets various industry cluster. It is important that the City continue to diversify its economic base and consider new areas for redevelopment.



Downtown continues to be key to the City's economic well-being and downtown housing is recommended for expansion, as well as better utilization of second and third floor spaces. Village centers are keys to Roanoke's residential neighborhoods. These recommended commercial and mixed use areas will provide unique environments and services to residents, thereby competing well with surrounding suburb development that relies on the automobile. Regional economic development and approaches continue to be recommended.

Infrastructure include regional transportation planning, multi-modal systems (pedestrians, bicycles, transit), airport, and technology infrastructure. More specifically, transportation systems do not stop at jurisdictional lines. Regional planning for transportation systems is important to ensuring quality development that enhances existing built communities. The development of multi modal transportation systems for cars, pedestrians, bicycles and transit is strongly recommended in the plan. The City should not be dependent on cars for transportation. It should encourage sidewalks, greenways, and bicycle facilities as well as considering transit alternatives in the future. The regional airport is important to economic development and to the residents of the region. Special attention is needed to ensure quality facilities and operations that adequately serve its users. If Roanoke is to attract new technology and businesses that use the technology, infrastructure must be provided to service those users. Continued leadership is needed to work with private businesses to provide services and promote them as available.

Public services include community policing, recycling, code administration and multi-service facilities. More specifically, community policing as a philosophy for providing public safety continues to be emphasized in making Roanoke safe. Recycling also was identified as very important to a sustainable community. Roanoke's programs will need Council's continued leadership to emphasize recycling as important. Code administration for building, zoning, development, and nuisance regulations should continue to be improved to meet the needs of Roanoke's citizens and businesses. Careful balancing of interests is important to the success of any new regulations that may be proposed.

Two multi-service facilities (or centers) are recommended as pilot projects to better serve citizens where the needs are the greatest. These are not meant to duplicate services provided by City Hall, but to provide better access to citizens where it is needed and to have City

staff work collaboratively in the community to address issues and needs. It is important to note that there are not community centers and will not be in every neighborhood. They could, however, be located in existing public buildings in a neighborhood.

The people plan element includes quality education, excellent facilities and programs, lifelong learning, workforce development and regional approaches for human services. More specifically, it is essential that Roanoke's school system continue to provide quality education to its youth. It is important that the school facilities and programs be outstanding and open to all citizens beyond school hours. Life long learning is essential to Roanoke's future for both young and old. The City's libraries and schools should provide quality programs to enhance continued education. Workforce development, which is education and training, is critical to both economic development initiatives and that of people. Regional approaches to providing human services should be encouraged and pursued.

The City design plan element includes design principles and collaborative work efforts. More specifically, the design of new buildings and facilities is critical to creating a beautiful City. The plan provides recommendations for various areas of the City including commercial corridors, streets and neighborhoods. These principles are not mandatory but should be encouraged. It is anticipated that the principles would be promoted through collaborative work efforts between City staff and private developers.

Ms. Lander identified the following key initiatives: target industry clusters, technology infrastructure, redevelop commercial and industrial land, village centers, multi-service facilities, new housing opportunities, critical amenities, marketing and tourism, streetscapes and healthy economy. More specifically, she advised that the ten initiatives were discussed during the planning process to help make the plan a reality; and these initiatives can be referred to as the "top ten" action items to be pursued by both government and private entities.

Ms. Lander advised that implementation tools include the City's zoning ordinance, integrated budgets, regional cooperation and public-private partnerships. More specifically, she stated that to assist in implementing the plan, additional strategies must be undertaken, as follows:

A new zoning ordinance should be developed over the next year.

City operating budgets and capital improvement program budget should reflect the Comprehensive Plan and adopted Neighborhood plans.

**Regional cooperation is necessary to effectively achieve many of the goals for the future.**

**Public private partnerships are essential to implementation of the plan. Government cannot do it alone.**

**In order to measure progress, Ms. Lander advised that it is recommended that the City administration provide Council and the citizens with an annual report card on actions taken or pending. In addition, she stated that it is recommended that community indicators be developed to assist in monitoring the sustainable community; discussions with Virginia Tech have already begun and the Vital Signs report from the New Century Council would also be of help. She added that continued citizen involvement is important to ensuring that Roanoke is doing what it needs to do; and ongoing planning for the City and its neighborhoods must continue.**

**Ms. Lander presented copy of public comments to date on the Comprehensive Plan.**

**Questions and comments by Council Members are summarized as follows:**

**Neighborhood schools should be celebrated. Is the City looking at the possibility of returning neighborhood schools to quadrants of the City? Neighborhood schools are the concept of the future in terms of neighborhood design.**

**Concern was expressed with regard to the condition of the main library in which the City Manager advised that the main library is addressed in the Downtown Roanoke Outlook Plan, with alternatives for Council's consideration. She stated that one recommendation has to do with re-siting a new library in Elmwood Park, but at a different location in order to maximize the park; and the other alternative is a total relocation of the library in order to provide for what is identified in the Outlook Roanoke Plan as a world class downtown park facility that would leave the entire park free of the building and would site the main library facility further into the downtown area. She further advised that at a future Council meeting, representatives of Downtown Roanoke, Inc., and the Outlook Roanoke Plan will be requested to make a presentation on all elements of the plan. In view of what is already on the plate and given the cost of a new library at either location, she stated that several years should be devoted to developing a constituency that will be**

prepared to build a first class library facility. She explained that the library issue is at least five years into the future in terms of becoming a reality in view of other City capital needs and other City projects. Question was raised as to how one builds a constituency for a library that is in the condition of Roanoke's.

The zoning ordinance should be revised using a process of going street by street and block by block and if the process is done correctly, requests for zoning variances will be a rare exception.

What options are available for underground utility lines and any changes should be incorporated in revisions to the zoning ordinance.

Some time between now and the August 20 public hearing, there should be a prioritizing of those portions of the Comprehensive Plan that are realistic and can be accomplished on a fast track. Quarterly status reports should be provided.

Should low income subsidized housing be spread out, not only throughout the City but throughout the neighborhoods? Should there be a clustering of social service agencies throughout the City or in one area?

The plan is designed to help each neighborhood become more viable economically, town centers are a critical component, and all neighborhoods need to understand why town centers would be beneficial in the future.

There will be sensitive issues and the City must be prepared to face those issues.

What are the City's plans to make village centers successful; whereupon, the City Manager advised that the first step is to identify those areas where village centers are desired and create an expectation with future developers that that is the route the City wishes to follow and the City will not settle for less. She stated that the City serves as the link between the developer and the neighborhood because none of the centers will succeed unless the neighborhood uses the services, therefore, developers will have to go into the neighborhoods and determine what types of support services or activities the immediate community, as well as the transient community, is willing to support; the

**City can then offer incentives through tax rebates, credits and certain kinds of rehabilitation; however, that which takes place on private property is the responsibility of the developer.**

**There being no further discussion or questions, without objection by Council, the Mayor advised that the briefing would be received and filed.**

**LEASES-HUMAN SERVICES: The City Manager introduced a briefing with regard to leasing a building for combined health, social services, and human services functions.**

**Vickie Price, Chief Social Work Supervisor, Department of Human Resources, advised that in the 1997 Long-Range Facilities Master Plan, Police Department and Health and Human Services space needs were identified as the top two priorities; needs of the Police Department are being addressed through a two-phase Capital Improvement Plan construction project; and the consultant determined the need for a one-stop Health and Human Services Building at approximately 90,000 square feet and an estimated cost of \$24 million. She stated that in October, 2000, a request for proposals was issued to determine developer interest in providing the proposed space; and at Council's March 10, 2001, Financial Planning Session, the City administration shared its intent to meet this space need through leasing and also discussed the fiscal year 2003 operation budget impact of the Health and Human Services Building.**

**She stated that Social Services, Health Department, Juvenile Justice, Human Services Coordinator and Office on Youth currently have 66,098 square feet of combined space, however, proposed space needs total 83,256 square feet. She advised that the advantage of leasing versus purchasing reduces up front capital costs for the City; the building will remain on the tax rolls should State funds be eliminated; the City is not liable for the building and associated costs; and most Federal and some State directives prefer the lease of real property.**

**Ms. Price advised that the advantages of the proposed location is the co-location of Health and Human Services functions which should result in improved public services; the site is accessible to Health and Human Services client populations; parking is available for clients and patients as well as staff; the location is supported by public transportation, with support installation of integrated data and communication systems, and sufficient staff/client training space and adequate office space. She reviewed a slide illustrating current limitations of individual office space and a slide showing proposed individual office space.**

**Ms. Price noted that a request for proposals was issued in October, 2000 for a facility to house Health and Human Services in one location (90,000 square feet); responses were received from representatives of the Cotton Mill Building at 6<sup>th</sup> Street, S. W., for \$1,728,191.00, the Heironimus Building on Jefferson Street for \$1,306,450.00 and the Sears Building on Williamson Road for \$1,305,957.00; and proposals were reviewed by representatives of Health and Human Services, the City Attorney's Office, and departments of Engineering, Finance, General Services and Management and Budget.**

**She explained that the proposal review committee selected the Sears building on February 7, 2001, as its top choice because the location is on bus lines and accessible to a majority of clients and patients; costs (proposed cost per square foot is within the original estimates) of \$13.27 per square foot for 83,236 square feet for a newly renovated building (build out cost of \$2.5 million), rent of \$1,104,541.72 per year for 20 years, \$801,807.00 annual reimbursement from the State, annual local share of \$302,734.72/\$3.64 per square foot; and parking in a lot that provides adequate parking for 397 spaces for clients, patients and staff. She advised that the City's responsibilities include design review and approval, direct installation of State-required computer wiring, cost of utilities, i.e. electric, water, sewer and review of renovation/construction cost documents; and the lease contractually obligates the landlord to invest \$2,497,080.00 in interior and exterior renovations, janitorial services and supplies, building maintenance, building repair and parking lot maintenance.**

**Ms. Price advised that the lease will be presented to Council for formal action on August 6, 2001, followed by submission to the State for review, complete detailed design drawings, with construction to be completed by August, 2002, and projected occupancy of the facilities during the first quarter of fiscal year 2003.**

**With regard to potential re-uses of the current space in Municipal North, the City Manager called attention to certain offices that are currently located off site from the Municipal Building complex and the first priority would be to bring those operations back to City Hall. Also, she called attention to the advantage of having the Roanoke Redevelopment and Housing Authority offices in the downtown area because of the close working relationship that will be required with the Housing Authority in the years ahead.**

**Question was raised as to whether Downtown Roanoke, Inc., has concerns with regard to the number of persons that will be leaving the downtown area as it relates to loss of business for downtown businesses; whereupon, the City Manager advised that Downtown Roanoke, Inc., is aware of the proposal and the President of**

**Downtown Roanoke, Inc., advises that Downtown Roanoke supports the concept of the Sears location which is not seen as having a negative impact.**

**There was discussion with regard to the 397 parking spaces that will also be available for civic center overflow parking in the evening.**

**It was explained that Social Service activities will be located on the second floor and a newly built third floor, the first floor will be vacant for other business purposes, the Health Department will be housed on the second floor and the third floor will also include administrative offices for each of the five agencies and office space for the remainder of staff.**

**Question was raised as to the proposed use of the current police building; whereupon, the City Manager advised that the plan previously reviewed by Council calls for demolishing the existing police building and using the space for parking for the entire complex.**

**Question was also raised as to the need for 86,000 square feet of available space, whereupon, Ms. Price advised that the department is required by State and Federal mandates to provide additional training for clients and staff and current space does not provide a sufficient area for training needs and visitation rooms. She stated that certain common areas will be shared such as conference rooms, kitchen space, etc.**

**The Mayor spoke to the advantages of considering the stadium/amphitheater issue in conjunction with the lease of the Sears building, because negotiations on both issues are closely related. He stated that in order for the stadium/amphitheater project to succeed, roadway adjustments will be needed and there is an opportunity to begin revitalization in the Wayne Street area.**

**The City Manager suggested that Council allow City staff to hire an architectural/engineering firm to prepare design work on the stadium/amphitheater project and to make recommendations on road improvements which could take six months or longer and would, in effect, delay the human services building project by another six months. She advised that there is the potential of convening a meeting of property owners along the Williamson Road area to discuss needed improvements which will help those businesses take advantage of additional traffic along Williamson Road when the stadium/amphitheater becomes a reality.**

**There were additional questions and comments with regard to the following:**

**What is the net cost of the lease compared with what it would cost if the principal only is reimbursed. Will improvements be added to the value of the property when calculating real estate taxes? Will a long term lease have any impact on the City's bonding capacity?**

**A shuttle bus could be provided for employees/clients of the building to the Williamson Road area and to downtown Roanoke from 12:00 noon until approximately 2:00 p.m.**

**A compatible tenant should be housed on the first floor.**

**Police vehicles should be parked at the rear of the building.**

**There being no further questions or comments, the Mayor advised that without objection by Council, the briefing would be received and filed.**

**There being no further business, the Mayor declared the meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.**